THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXII.—APRIL, 1897.—No. 86.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

THE vivid interest manifested of late in the Book of Acts is due to the contrariety of opinions concerning its authorship and origin, defended by men whose pride and glory rest on their unwearied, though not always salutary, labors in the field of Scripture study. In a former volume, M. Renan had declared his opinion that "the author of the third Gospel and the Acts was verily and indeed (*bien reelement*) Luke, a disciple of St. Paul."[1] In a later instalment of his work he condemns as untenable the view that the first person plural of the later chapters of Acts is derived from some earlier document inserted by the author, on the ground that these portions are identical in style with the rest of the work.[2] Though this expression of opinion proceeds from a not too conservative critic, and agrees with the unbroken tradition of the past,[3] it does not find much favor in the eyes of Harnack. The latter's own theory[4] is briefly this: The Acts of the Apostles was ushered in the West into a position of authority first about A.D. 180, being selected for this position on account of the use that could be made of it in the controversy with the followers of Marcion. Irenæus and the writer of the Muratorian Fragment, says the critic, exaggerated with controversial purpose the claims of the book, calling it the "Acts of All the Apostles," and asserting that St. Luke was present at every incident which he describes. But the earlier standing of Acts, according to Harnack, was still preserved in Egypt after A.D. 180. There we find Clement of

[1] *Les Apôtres*, p. xviii. [2] *Les Évangiles*, p. 436.
[3] *Cf.* Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 200.
[4] *Das N. T. um das Jahr*, 200.

Alexandria using the Acts only as one of many sources for the history of the apostles. Even Zahn says that Clement quotes the "Preaching of Peter" without making any visible distinction of authority between it and the Acts of the Apostles.

One of the most important contributions to the textual criticism and the interpretation of Acts that have appeared in this century is its new edition by the veteran Greek scholar Dr. F. Blass, of Halle. This writer leads a conservative reaction in Germany; he accepts the Lucan authorship and the unity of Acts unhesitatingly. He, moreover, maintains that St. Luke wrote two copies of Acts, slightly divergent from one another, and that our so-called Eastern text of the book springs from one, the Western from the other, of the two Lucan copies. Both texts then have equal authority, provided that we can recover their original from amid the corruptions which have affected them.[1] On the other hand, Prof. W. M. Ramsay[2] assures us that after mature consideration he is confirmed in the opinion that the text as settled by Dr. Blass is not Lucan; that it has a fatal superficial smoothness, and that it lacks much of the rather harsh but intensely individual style of Luke, neglecting entirely some of the literary forms created by Luke. According to Ramsay, the Western text is really a second century commentary on Acts, the work of one who had no respect for the words, but much for the facts, who wished to make the book complete and clear, who had spoken with some of the actors in the history, or at least with those who had seen some of the actors. The author ascribes to the Western text a distinct and independent value; first, as preserving of said corruptions an independent second century witness, to aid us where all the great uncials are at fault; secondly, as giving the idea entertained about the meaning of the text during the first half of the second century in the churches that lay along the great line of connection between Antioch and Ephesus; and thirdly, as recording on trustworthy independent evidence certain facts which were omitted by Luke.

In order to appreciate the foregoing opinions and others similar to them at their true value, one must be versed in the difficulties and intricacies implied in the question of the authenticity of Acts. We shall, therefore, review, first, the principal adverse theories on the authorship of the book; in the second place, we shall state and examine the main arguments against the Lucan origin of Acts; finally, we shall explain the main reasons that force us to defend the Lucan authorship of Acts in its full extent and its traditional simplicity.

---

[1] *Cf. Acta Apostolorum* . . . . edidit Fridericus Blass, Lipsiæ, Teubner, 1896.

[2] *Expositor*, February and March, 1895, pp. 129–142, 212–225.

It was a matter of vital importance for the Tübingen school to bring the Book of Acts down to a late date. For, if the work was written by a companion of St. Paul, the third gospel, which confessedly has the same authorship, must have been written by one in immediate contact with eye-witnesses, and must be regarded as thoroughly historical. Since the Tübingen theories regard every Christian book of the New Testament, however innocently it may appear to give straightforward history, as really written with a secret design to inculcate certain dogmatic views, just as, of Mr. Dickens's novels, one is intended to expose the abuses of the Poor Law system, another of the Court of Chancery, another of Ecclesiastical Courts, it evidently follows that the historical credibility of any canonical book of the New Testament once established, the foundation of the Tübingen school is demolished. This appears at least to be the logical result; in point of fact, the theories of our opponents resemble certain low organisms, that do not suffer at all by losing half of their body, since the remaining half walks away with apparently increased vital powers. The dogmatic views inculcated by the New Testament are, according to the adherents of the Tübingen movement, partly the Judaizing tendencies of Peter, partly the universalistic doctrine of Paul, partly the conciliatory efforts striving to unite the Petrine and Pauline parties into one church of Christ. For, starting from the figments of the Homilies and the Recognitions attributed to Clement of Rome as true historical works, the foregoing writers contend that, according to Peter's doctrine, our Lord did not found a new church, but only reformed Judaism, intending to spread it everywhere, and make it the universal means of salvation; while, according to the doctrine of Paul, our Lord instituted a new church, wholly distinct from the Mosaic dispensation, and intended to supplant the latter, even among the Jewish people, so that Christ and his church became the necessary means of grace and life. The incipient period of this party strife is represented by the Apocalypse on the side of Peter, and by the epistles to the Galatians, the Romans and the Corinthians on the side of Paul. During the second period Peter's doctrine is set forth in the first gospel and the Epistle of James, while Paul's views are defended in the third gospel and the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, the Hebrews, and to Philemon. The attempts to reconcile the two parties made in the third period may be traced in the second and fourth gospel, in Acts, the Epistles of Peter, John and Jude, and also in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

After stating the general outlines of the Tübingen tenets, we are enabled to understand the allied views held concerning the Book

of Acts in particular. Some of these necessarily imply a conscious tampering with history on the part of the author of Acts, others admit an unconscious misrepresentation of facts and conditions, pronounced enough to destroy the historical credibility of the book. Both classes of opinions will be briefly stated, at least in their principal representative forms.

Schneckenburger[1] ascribed to Acts the object of defending Paulinism against the early party of Peter and its Judaizing tendency. This view of the book was elaborated by Baur, who had previously treated Acts as not purely historical,[2] and who now endeavored to prove that a representation of this kind must necessarily be altogether untrustworthy and unhistorical.[3] In order to uphold Paulinism against Judaism, which had gained the ascendancy, the author, according to Baur, lessens its opposition to the Jewish law, conceals Paul's disagreement with the primitive apostles, and tries to heal the internal division in the primitive church by exciting a common hatred against the unbelieving Jews.[4] While Schwegler[5] modified Baur's view so far as to make Acts a vindication of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and an attempt to mediate between the two parties by an apparent history, Zeller[6] followed out Baur's view by an acute criticism of Acts in all its details. His proof for the falsification of history in the interest of conciliation, the author derives from a comparison of Acts with the Pauline epistles. The same intentional tampering with historic truth on the part of the author of Acts is admitted by Hilgenfeld,[7] Hausrath,[8] Holsten,[9] Volkmar,[10] and others. It may be added that Hilgenfeld places the authorship of Acts in 95 A.D., Volkmar in the beginning of the second century, Schwegler, Zeller, Hausrath in the times of Adrian and Trajan.

If the foregoing writers admit intentional falsifications of history on the part of the author of Acts in the interest of union and peace between the early Christian parties, the following critics admit historical errors indeed, but errors springing from ignorance and prejudice rather than from bad will. De Wette[11] repudiates the tendency-criticism of the Tübingen school without acknowledging

[1] *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, Bern, 1841.

[2] Tübing. *Zeitschr.*, 1836, 3; 1838, 3.

[3] *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845; 2d ed., 1866–67.

[4] *Cf.* Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, N. Y., 1889, ii., p. 328.

[5] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 1846.

[6] *Theolog. Jahrb.*, 1849–51; *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht*, Stuttgart, 1854.

[7] *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875.

[8] *Neutestam. Zeitgesch.*, 2d ed., ii., iii., 1875.

[9] *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, i., 1880.

[10] *Paulus von Damaskus bis zum Galaterbrief*, 1887.

[11] *Cf. Comment.*, i., 4, 1838; 4th ed., 1870.

the history of Acts as truthful enough to proceed from the pen of St. Luke. Bruno Baur[1] proceeds on the assumption that the settlement which, according to the Tübingen school, was first attempted by the Book of Acts, had really been accomplished before Acts was written, and that the early Christian divisions had become unintelligible to the conservative author accustomed to a state of Christianity in which Judaism had conquered. Lekebusch[2] rejects the tendency theory, but is still very moderate in its repudiation. Renan admits that the historical Luke is the author of Acts,[3] but considers his work better calculated to describe the author's own time than that of Peter and Paul. Overbeck[4] practically returns to Bruno Baur's position: the fundamental questions of the apostolic period have lost their significance for the Pauline author of Acts, who no longer recognizes Gentile Christianity as the fruit of the Pauline gospel, but regards it as the legitimate offspring of primitive apostolic teaching; the Gentile Christianity of Acts stands nearer to the legal Jewish Christianity than to Paulinism. Hence Wittichen[5] and Scholten[6] make the author of Acts a Jewish Christian, who indeed makes certain concessions to the advancing Gentile Christianity and its apostle, but sacrifices the independence of both to Jewish Christianity. According to Schenkel,[7] the author of Acts was the Pauline disciple of history, but the Paul described in Acts is not the Paul of history.[8] Straatman[9] sees in Acts an apology for Christianity as represented by Paul the Roman citizen. According to Pfleiderer,[10] the book is indifferent to the internal divisions in the Church, is hostile to the existing Judaism, and defends the religious and political rights of the Gentile Christians. Reuss,[11] Mangold,[12] Keim,[13] Pfleiderer,[14] Weizsäcker,[15] consider Acts as composed from a harmless and conciliatory point of view, not wholly destructive of its historical credibility; actual departure from historical truth is not intentional, but is due to the author's one-sided emphasis of the

---

[1] *Die Apostelgesch.*, 1850.
[2] *Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgesch.*, 1854.
[3] *Les Apôtres*, 1866; *St. Paul*, 1869.
[4] *Komm.*, 1870; *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.*, 1871, 1; 1872, 3.
[5] *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.*, 1873; *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1877.
[6] *Das paulinische Evangelium*, 1881.
[7] *Characterbild Jesu*, 4th ed., 1873, p. 361.
[8] *Cf. Christusbild der Apostel.*, 1879, pp. 176 f.
[9] *Paulus de Apostel von Jesus Christus*, 1879.
[10] *Der Paulinismus*, 1876; 2d ed., 1890; *das Urchristenthum*, 1887.
[11] *La Bible*, N. T., ii., 1876; *die Geschichte d. h. Schriften*, N. T., 6th ed., 1887.
[12] *Cf.* Bleek, *Einleitung*, 4th ed., 1886, pp. 431 f., 436 f., 462.
[13] *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, 1878, pp. 46 f.; 64 f.
[14] *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1893, pp. 78 f.
[15] *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 1886.

particulars favorable to his tendency. Wendt[1] believes that the author of Acts supposes two post-apostolic truths: first, the catholic character of Christianity and its moral necessity for salvation; secondly, the apostolic endeavor to propagate the Christian religion universally. According to Holtzmann,[2] critics are agreed in regarding Acts as history unconsciously distorted by its author; doubt and controversy regard only the degree of misrepresentation. It may be added that Lekebusch, Trip, Ewald, Lechler, Bleek, Renan, Schenkel and Weiss place the authorship of Acts about 80 A.D., Wendt between 75 and 100 A.D., Mangold about 90 A.D., Weizsäcker at the end of the first century, Volkmar, Wittichen, Jacobsen in the beginning of the second century, Overbeck, Keim, Hausrath, Pfleiderer, Usener in the times of Trajan and Adrian, Straatman about the year 150 after Christ.

After this brief list of opinions concerning the authorship of the Book of Acts advocated by the Tübingen School and its cognate critics, we must consider the grounds on which these theories are based. The main proofs advanced by the critics for the historical inaccuracy of the Book of Acts may be reduced to the following four:[3] First, the author does not understand the antagonisms of the apostolic age; secondly, his statements conflict with those in St. Paul's epistles; thirdly, he artificially balances the histories of Sts. Peter and Paul against each other; fourthly, he ignores and glosses over the differences between St. Paul and the other apostles. In order to appreciate these arguments at their true value, we must review them singly, inquiring into both their strength and their weakness.

1. It is true that, in Acts, Gentile Christianity is not represented as the original foundation of the Apostle Paul breaking through the limits of traditional Judaism, but is really the outcome of primitive apostolic teaching.[4] The catholicity of Christianity was, according to the Book of Acts, intended from its first foundation,[5] and was from the first preached to the Jews.[6] It was the Jews that effected the realization of Christian Catholicism, partly by their persecutions, partly by their unbelief. Jewish persecution caused the first Christian mission[7] and forced even St. Paul to evangelize the Gentiles;[8] hence it is that in the first part of Acts we read of the conversion of the Samaritans,[9] of the baptism of proselytes by

---

[1] *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1891, p. 184.

[2] *Handcomm.*, 2d ed., 1892, p. 309.

[3] *Cf.* Sanday, "Inspiration," *Bampton Lectures for* 1893, pp. 320 ff.

[4] *Cf.* Overbeck, *Komm.*, 1870, xxxiii.; Hilgenfeld, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in d. N. T.*, 1875, pp. 586, 594.

[5] Acts, i., 8; ii., 6–11.

[6] Acts, ii., 39; iii., 25, 26.

[7] Acts, viii., 1.

[8] ix., 29, 30

[9] Acts, viii., 4–8, 25.

Philip and Peter,[1] and of the evangelization of the Greeks.[2] When Paul appears on the scene, he walks in the well-known paths of his predecessors, and is even authorized by the Jerusalem community to devote himself to the Gentile mission.[3] On his missionary journeys we find that in almost every town the unbelief of the Jews[4] impels the apostle to seek the Gentiles with special fervor, and that he finds a ready belief among the latter.[5]

But while Acts maintains the unity and identity of principle followed by Paul and the other apostles, it also faithfully records those instances of friction and doubt that would occur almost of necessity in the rising Christian community. It tells of the difficulty between the widows of the Hellenistic Christians and those of the native-born Palestinians;[6] it records the mission of Peter and John to the new Samaritan converts in order to lay their hands upon them;[7] it describes the doubt of the proselyte eunuch[8] and the perplexity of the Jerusalem Church over the baptism of Cornelius and Peter's converse with Gentiles;[9] it knows that the great controversy of the apostolic age culminates in the necessity of the circumcision,[10] and first comes to a head in the church at Antioch. Considering that, at the time when Acts was written, the opposition between Judaism and Christianity was complete, that the doubts about the obligation of the Mosaic Law on converts from heathenism had been settled, and that Jewish Pharisaism had fully developed into an anti-Christian party, it is certainly a strikingly authentic touch in Acts that Christians of Jerusalem are represented as living in peace with the mass of their unbelieving neighbors, that certain believing Pharisees insist on the necessity of circumcision,[11] that the proportion and order of doctrinal development in the Christian community are so accurately preserved. Even the relations of Paul to Peter and James are precisely those that we should naturally expect to find in men of practical experience in affairs. Whatever course of action a rigid theory of logical consistency may seem to demand of them, we know that Paul met the Judaizing apostles, if we may so name them, half-way,[12] that Peter was overwhelmed with Paul's singular success, and that James anxiously mediated between Paul and the zealots for the Jewish law.[13] Acts gives, therefore, not only a relia-

---

[1] Acts, viii., 26–40; x., 1–xi., 18.
[2] xi., 19–21.
[3] Acts, xv., 1–34.
[4] Acts, xiii., 6–12, 42–50; xiv., 1–5, 18, 19; xviii., 7–17; xxviii., 28–31.
[5] Acts, xvi., 29–34; xvii., 4, 12, 34; xviii., 4; xix., 10, 17, 26.
[6] Acts, viii., 14.
[7] Acts, vi., 1.
[8] Acts, viii., 37 ff.
[9] Acts, xi., 1 ft.
[10] Acts, xv.
[11] Acts, xv., 1 ff.
[12] I. Cor., ix., 20; *cf.* Schürer, *Theol. Literaturz.*, 1882, col., 348.
[13] Acts, xxi., 20 ff.

ble, but an eminently accurate picture of the internal antagonisms of the early Christian community.

2. The foregoing conclusion is not contradicted by a comparison of Acts with the Pauline epistles. The pretended conflict between them may be reduced to negative and positive discrepancies. The principal instances of the former kind are these four omissions: in Acts: first, the history of Titus, the Gentile friend and uncircumcised assistant of Paul,[1] whose companionship appears to have caused the apostle trouble in Jerusalem,[2] and to have led to the disagreement between him and Peter;[3] secondly, the labors of the Jewish emissaries coming to the churches of Galatia and Corinth;[4] thirdly, the missionary journeys of the other apostles, on which they are said to have been accompanied by their wives;[5] fourthly, all notice concerning James, the bishop of Jerusalem, who can be identified with the brother of the Lord only by the testimony of the epistle to the Galatians.[6]

Similarly, we may reduce the alleged positive discrepancies between Acts and the epistles of Paul to these five: first, the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts xi., 30, contradicts Gal. ii., 1, since it does not precede the apostle's visit to the capital, mentioned in this latter passage, by fourteen years. Secondly, the subordination of Paul to Barnabas described in Acts ix., 26; xi., 30; xii., 25, is opposed to his independent manner of preaching as described in Gal. i., 1, 12. Thirdly, Paul's pretended application[7] of the decree[8] passed by the apostolic council[9] on occasion of Peter's Gentile mission,[10] and the subsequent establishment of the Gentile church at Antioch,[11] renders unintelligible the conflict that occasioned the epistle to the Galatians.[12] Fourthly, the principle stated in the Book of Acts,[13] that everywhere the Jews must be evangelized first,[14] and the Gentiles only in case of Jewish obstinacy in error,[15] conflicts with Paul's views advanced in his epistles to the churches of Galatia,[16] Rome[17] and Corinth,[18] and with the complete silence in the epistles to the Corinthians concerning his breach with the Jews of that city, with the absence of all mention of Jews in the epistles

---

[1] II. Cor., ii., 13; vii., 6, 7, 13–15; viii., 6, 16, 17, 23; xii., 18.
[2] Gal., ii., 1, 3.
[3] Gal., ii., 11–14.
[4] *Cf.* Gal., Cor., etc.
[5] I. Cor., ix., 5.
[6] i., 19; ii., 9.
[7] Acts, xv., 30; xvi., 4.
[8] Acts, xv., 23–29.
[9] Acts, xv., 7–9.
[10] Acts, x., 1–xi., 18.
[11] Acts, xi., 22–26; xv., 1.
[12] Gal., ii., 6, 10, 12.
[13] xiii., 46, 47; xviii., 6; xxviii., 26–28.
[14] Acts, xiii., 5, 14; xiv., 1; xvi. 13; xvii., 1, 2, 10, 17; xviii., 4, 19; xix, 8.
[15] Acts, xiii., 8, 45; xiv., 2, 19; xvii., 5, 13; xviii., 6; xix., 9; *cf.* xiii., 46–48; xviii., 7; xix., 9.
[16] ii., 9; iii., 28; iv., 21–23.
[17] i., 14; ii., 28, 29; iii., 29, 30; iv., 11, 16.
[18] I. Cor., i., 24.

to the Thessalonians, and finally with the circumstance that sickness and not Jewish obstinacy was the real occasion of Paul's missionary labors in Galatia.[1] Fifthly, Paul's accommodation to and compliance with the Jewish ceremonial[2] and his protestations of loyalty to the Mosaic Law contained in the Book of Acts,[3] are hardly in agreement with the Pauline counsels,[4] principles,[5] and practices[6] as represented in the epistles.

It is true that there are differences, and perhaps considerable differences, between Acts and St. Paul's epistles. But, on the other hand, a great number of agreements have been pointed out in Paley's "Horae Paulinæ," in Professor Blunt's "Undesigned Coincidences" and Lechler's "das apostolische Zeitalter."[7] Lightfoot[8] is of opinion that "any writer . . . . who will take the pains to go carefully over Paley's discussion of the passages relating to the contributions for the Christian poor at Jerusalem, observing how they dovetail into one another, may satisfy himself of the validity of the argument. Yet it is plain that the writer of Acts was unacquainted with these epistles, or, at all events, that if he had ever seen them, he made no use of them in compiling his history." On the whole, for every point of difference between Acts and the epistles it would be easy to bring at least four of striking coincidence and harmony, which are a perfectly sound vindication of the trustworthiness of the apostolic history. The instances of discrepancy only need to be judged in a human and reasonable spirit in order to vanish.

As to the negative discrepancies between Acts and the Pauline Epistles, or discrepancies founded on the silence of Acts concerning certain facts related in the epistles, it must be kept in mind that the knowledge of the author of Acts was necessarily very limited, depending on a few rough notes or scraps of narrative, and the memory of communicative eye-witnesses. Now Paul, the principal source of information, would naturally be reserved on points tending to his own praise, or involving blame of others, unless necessity obliged him to speak of these details. Hence we understand why Luke remained ignorant of the apostle's journey into Arabia, of his dispute at Jerusalem concerning the circumcision of Titus and of the rebuke administered to Peter at Antioch.[9] The silence concerning Titus cannot surprise us, if we consider the comparative unimportance of that disciple in the eyes of Luke.

---

[1] Gal., iv., 13, 14.
[2] xvi., 3; xxi., 23–27; xviii., 21, 22; xxi., 15; xxiv., 17.
[3] xxii., 1, 6; xxiv, 15; xxvi., 5–7.
[4] I. Cor., vii., 17–18.
[5] Gal., v., 2–4.
[6] Gal., ii., 13, 14.
[7] Third ed., pp. 12 ff.
[8] *Dictionary of the Bible*, new ed., p. 34.
[9] Gal. i., 17; ii., 1, 3; ii., 11–14.

He had been with Paul in Jerusalem, before Luke became the apostle's companion.[1] On the apostle's third missionary journey he was sent from Ephesus to Corinth,[2] at a time when Luke himself appears to have resided in Philippi.[3] Next, Titus met Paul in Macedonia, and after giving an account of his work in Corinth, he was sent back as the bearer of the apostle's second letter to that church,[4] so that Luke and Titus must, at best, have been but slightly acquainted with each other, for the next mention of Titus[5] belongs to about 66 or 67 A.D., or the time before Paul's second imprisonment. As to Luke's omitting the missionary labors of the other apostles, and the genealogical record of James, bishop of Jerusalem, we need only point out the irrelevancy of these omissions. That I. Cor., ix., 5, refers to the wives of the apostles, is a groundless assertion.[6]

The alleged positive discrepancies between Acts and the Pauline epistles are rather carried into the inspired documents than really found therein. (1) It is true that the apostle writes to the Galatians:[7] "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me," referring here to his third visit to Jerusalem;[8] on the other hand, the apostle's third visit occurred fourteen years after his first visit,[9] not after his second.[10] Does, then, the epistle to the Galatians really contradict the Book of Acts on this point? In the epistle the apostle intends to prove that he had received his doctrine not from the other apostles, but from Christ himself; he therefore enumerates only those visits to Jerusalem during which he had met one of the other apostles. Now such a meeting had occurred on his first visit to Jerusalem, and again on the third, but not on the second. What more natural, therefore, than the omission of the second visit to Jerusalem in the epistle to the Galatians? What more accurate than that fourteen years elapsed between Paul's first meeting with other apostles in Jerusalem and a second meeting of the same kind?[11]

(2) The subordination of Paul to Barnabas[12] was his natural position during the first few years after his conversion, and does not at all contradict the apostle's independent spirit shown several years later in his epistle to the Galatians.[13] The account of the Book of Acts on this point deserves, therefore, the highest commendation of historical accuracy.

---

[1] Gal., ii., 1, 3; *cf.* Acts, xv., 2.
[2] II. Cor., vii., 6–9; viii., 6; xii., 18; *cf.* Acts, xix.
[3] Acts, xvi., 10–17.
[4] II. Cor., viii., 16, 17, 23.
[5] Tit., i., 5.
[6] *Cf.* Cornely, Comm. in I. Cor. pp. 240 ff.
[7] Gal., ii., 1.
[8] Acts, xv., 2 ff.
[9] Acts, ix., 26 ff.
[10] Acts, xi., 27 ff.
[11] *Cf.* Cornely, Comm. in Gal. pp. 418 ff.
[12] Acts, ix., 26; xi., 30; xii., 25.
[13] Gal., i., 1, 12.

(3) Paul's silence in his epistle to the Galatians concerning the apostolic decree pronouncing the equality of the Gentiles with the Jewish converts[1] is easily explained: First, the apostles had promulgated the decree in question probably a few months before the Galatian troubles, but its authority had not been sufficient to check the Judaizers; secondly, the latter had changed their position to some extent after the council of Jerusalem, maintaining no longer that circumcision was necessary for salvation, but denying that the uncircumcised Gentile converts were as perfect Christians as the converts who had submitted to circumcision.[2] It is clear, therefore, that in the epistle to the Galatians an appeal to the apostolic decree would have been not only useless, but also unreasonable and dangerous.

(4) The argument built on Paul's mission-practice, as described in Acts and his epistles, furnishes another instance of artificially constructed discrepancy. In order to have a real discrepancy on this point, it must be proved that it was Paul's invariable principle and practice, according to the Book of Acts, to address the Jewish community in every place before seeking the conversion of the Gentiles, and that the opposite is true according to the Pauline epistles. The first part is admittedly false, since Acts, xiii., 7–12; xiv., 6, 7, 21; xvii., 11, 12, 17–34, furnish noted exceptions to the pretended rule; the second part cannot be proved, to say the least; in the epistles to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians there was no call for mentioning the Jews of the respective cities; in Gal., iv., 13, 14, we have at best an instance parallel to the foregoing exceptions mentioned in Acts; the other passages of the Pauline epistles merely state that since God is the God of the Jews and the Gentiles alike[3] the apostle considers himself a debtor to all,[4] feeling assured that even the uncircumcised according to the flesh can have the true gift of faith,[5] that only the circumcised of heart are the true Israel of God,[6] and, moreover, that those baptized in Christ are on terms of perfect equality before God, whether they be Jews or Gentiles.[7] From none of these statements can we infer that the Pauline epistles proclaim either a principle or a practice of the apostle different from those maintained in the Book of Acts.

(5) Finally, we may freely grant that St. Paul advised the Corinthians[8] not to seek salvation in circumcision; that he regarded circumcision undergone in the spirit of the Judaizers who disturbed the Galatian Church as rendering Christ void, and caus-

---

[1] Acts, xv.
[2] *Cf.* Cornely, Introd., iii., p. 334.
[3] Rom., iii., 29, 30.
[4] Rom., i., 14.
[5] Rom., iv., 11, 16.
[6] Rom., ii., 28, 29; Gal., iv., 21–23.
[7] Gal., iii., 28; I. Cor., i., 24.
[8] I. Cor., vii., 17, 18.

ing its recipients to fall from grace[1]; that he rebuked St. Peter for complying with Jewish practices when there was danger of strengthening the Judaizing party in its false assumptions.[2] Granting all this, we do not see any inconsistency in Paul's circumcising Timothy (Acts xvi., 3), when there was no danger of scandal, but great hope of making Timothy more useful for the Jewish mission; nor in Paul's exercising certain ascetical practices of vows, prayers and visits to the House of God[3] that were to be retained in the Christian Church, though in a slightly different outward form; nor, finally, in Paul's profession that he had been a Jew zealous for the law[4], and that he shared with the Pharisees their belief in the resurrection of the dead.[5] We believe that in all these instances the alleged discrepancies between the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles are artificially carried into the history of Paul's attitude to Judaism, as told in the two said sources.

3. The third main difficulty of our opponents against the historical reliability of Acts is based on the author's artificial method of balancing the history of Paul against that of Peter. According to the contention of these opponents, the Book of Acts is divided into two uneven parts, the first comprising the first twelve, the second the last sixteen chapters of the work. Each of these parts is subdivided into two portions: Just as Peter's ministry in Jerusalem[6] and Peter's work in the incipient Gentile missions[7] are described in the first part, so we read in the second part first of Paul's mission among the common Gentiles[8], and then of his incipient Roman ministry.[9] Throughout these parts our opponents discover a number of artificial parallelisms between the histories of the two heroes: Both begin their ministry by miraculously healing a lame man[10]; both are imprisoned and falsely accused before the political authorities;[11] both gain the upper hand over a sorcerer;[12] both work numberless miracles during their missionary labors;[13] both are extremely feared by the evil spirit;[14] both find favor with the Pharisees;[15] both are cruelly scourged;[16] both have a subordinate assistant, Peter in Philip, Paul in Apollos;[17] both give the new converts the Holy Ghost and his supernatural charismata;[18] both raise a dead person to life;[19] both are offered

---

[1] Gal., v., 2–4. [2] Gal., ii., 13, 14.
[3] Acts, xxi., 23–27; xviii., 21, 22; xxi., 15; xxiv., 17.
[4] Acts, xxii., 1–6. [5] Acts, xxiv., 15; xxvi., 5–7. [6] Acts, i.–v.
[7] Acts, vi.–xii. [8] Acts, xiii.–xxi., 18. [9] Acts, xxi., 19; xxviii., 31.
[10] Acts, iii., 2–10; xiv., 8–10. [11] IV., 1 ff.; *cf.* v., 18 ff.; xxi., 33 ff.
[12] v., 1–11; *cf.* viii., 18–24; xiii., 6–11; xix., 13–17. [13] v., 15; xix., 12.
[14] v., 16; viii., 7; xvi., 18; xix., 11, 15; xxviii., 9. [15] Acts, v., 34; xxiii., 9.
[16] v, 40; xvi., 22 ff. [17] Acts, viii., 5–8; 14–17; xviii., 24–xix., 1.
[18] Acts, viii., 14–17; x., 44, 46; xix., 1–7.
[19] Acts, ix., 33; 36–42; xx., 9–12; xxviii., 8.

divine adoration against their will;[1] both are miraculously freed from prison, Peter by an angel, Paul by an earthquake;[2] and, finally, Paul is stoned at Lystra, as Stephen is stoned at Jerusalem.[3] Hence our opponents infer that Acts is an artificially constructed book in which every speech or miracle of Peter has its counterpart in some act or speech or miracle of Paul, and that, furthermore, fiction fills a far greater part in both halves than fact.

But such an inference is not borne out by the premises of the argument; for, on the one hand, the alleged parallelism can be completed only by much straining and exaggeration, and, on the other, such real correspondence as exists in Acts is not more than must be expected in any history of men placed in the same situations and conditions. Instances of a strained correspondence we have in the history of Ananias and Sapphira, and the rejection of Simon Magus by Peter,[4] as compared with the blinding of Elymas by Paul;[5] in the defence of the apostles by Gamaliel,[6] as compared with the protection of Paul by the Pharisees;[7] in the relation of Philip's ministry to Peter, as compared with the relation of Apollos' ministry to Paul;[8] in the alleged adoration of Peter by Cornelius,[9] as compared with the adoration of Paul at Lystra;[10] in Peter's liberation from prison by an angel,[11] as compared with Paul's liberation by an earthquake;[12] in the real martyrdom of Stephen,[13] as compared with the apparent death of Paul.[14] In none of these instances do we find a real correspondence between the history of Peter and that of Paul, so that our opponents' premise must be simply denied in so far as it embraces these cases.

But even where our opponents' premise is true, where there is a real parallelism between the history of Peter and that of Paul, it does not prove that Acts is fiction rather than objective truth. For the real similarities between the lives of the two apostles, their exorcisms, *e.g.*, and numerous miracles, their communication of the Holy Ghost and indefatigable zeal for souls, their persecutions and actual sufferings, cannot surprise us in men that lived at the same time, followed the same calling, labored under the same difficulties and were surrounded by the same circumstances.[15] In

---

[1] Acts, x., 25, 26; xiv., 11–15; xxviii., 6.
[2] Acts, xii., 7 ff.; xvi., 26 ff.
[3] Acts, vii., 58 f.; xiv., 18.
[4] Acts, v., 1 ff.; viii., 18–24.
[5] Acts, xiii., 6–11.
[6] Acts, v. 34 ff.
[7] Acts, xxiii., 9.
[8] Acts, viii., 5–8, 14–17; xviii., 24–xix., 1.
[9] Acts, x., 25 f.
[10] Acts, xiv., 11–15; *cf.* xxviii., 6.
[11] Acts, xii., 7 ff.
[12] Acts, xvi., 26 ff.
[13] Acts, vii., 58 f.
[14] Acts, xiv., 18.
[15] Cf. Sanday, "Inspiration," *Bampton Lectures*, 1893, pp. 326 f.; C. Clemen, *Prolegomena zur Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1892, pp. 17 f.; Meyer-Wendt, *Apostelgesch.*, 5th ed., pp. 6 f.; Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas*, p. 214.

fact, it would be urged as an argument against the historical credibility of Acts, if there were no correspondence between the public life of Peter and that of Paul. Nor can the omission of many incidents be urged as an argument for an artificially constructed parallelism, for we have seen already that the author of Acts omits many incidents either described or alluded to in the Pauline Epistles. If the writer had intended to construct an artificial parallelism between Peter and Paul by his omissions, he might have produced a much more striking work. Why narrate Paul's imprisonment and captivity so minutely? Why relate his voyage to Rome so accurately? Why describe his life as a captive in the capital? Why omit Peter's residence, sufferings and death in the same city? These slight modifications of the work would have increased the correspondence between the public life of Peter and that of Paul considerably, without taxing the author's powers inordinately.

4. The fourth source of difficulties against the historical credibility of Acts springs from its construction of an excessive peace and harmony in the ancient Church. *a.* The opposition between the Jews and the Apostles vanishes, because a Pharisee advises the Jewish authorities to grant freedom of religious development to the apostolic ministry.[1] The artificial character of this incident is manifest on account of an accompanying anachronism.[2] *b.* The opposition between the Jewish and Gentile Christians is made to disappear, because the speeches placed in the mouth of Peter[3] proclaim the principles of Paul, and those placed in the mouth of Paul represent the views of Peter. *c.* Moreover, the Pauline orations are arranged so artificially that they must be the product of the author of Acts; on his first missionary journey Paul addresses a Jewish audience[4] concerning the Messianic character of Jesus; on his second journey he speaks to Gentiles concerning the true God and our obligations to Him;[5] on his third journey the Apostle addresses his principal oration to a Christian audience,[6] warning them against future temptations. Similarly, each of the three stages of the apostle's captivity presents an apostolic address; the first is delivered before the Jewish people,[7] the second before a Gentile court,[8] and the third before the highest Jewish and Gentile authorities.[9] *d.* Besides, in these orations we find the same characteristics of language and style that mark the other parts of the Book of Acts. Greek thought, and quotations

[1] Acts, v., 34.
[2] Acts, v., 36, 37.
[3] Acts, xi., 5–17; xv., 5–11; *cf.* ii., 14–36; iii., 12–26.
[4] Acts, xiii., 16–41.
[5] Acts, xvii., 22–31.
[6] Acts, xx., 17–35.
[7] Acts, xxii., 1–21.
[8] Acts, xxiv., 10–21.
[9] Acts, xxvi., 2–23.

from the Greek version of the Old Testament are found even in the speeches addressed to an Aramæan audience.[1] *e.* Finally, Acts relates mainly the first foundation of churches by the apostle Paul, but describes his pastoral work very briefly,[2] or summarizes the same in certain systematic formulas,[3] or, again, omits it entirely.[4]

On the other hand, it must be kept in mind that most of these peculiarities are precisely what we must expect in an author like the writer of Acts. *a.* Let us grant, for argument's sake, that the author of Acts represents the opposition between Judaism and Christianity less vividly than he might do within the lines of perfect truthfulness. Does this deprive his book of its historical credibility? Can a mathematical line be drawn between historic fidelity and historic falsehood of a work? Even if such a line could be drawn, would the critics of our own century be more likely to stand on the side of objective truth than the author of Acts? In point of fact, every reader of Acts knows that the argument of the critics is based not on the general attitude of the synagogue towards Christianity, but on the extraordinary equity of Gamaliel;[5] that the Jewish leaders imprisoned the Apostles, scourged them, drove them from Palestine to the Jews of the dispersion and the Gentiles, killed the more prominent Christian teachers, Stephen and James, *e.g.*, and impeded the spread of Christianity in every possible way. Since the author of Acts describes all this hostility on the part of Judaism, we fail to see his construction of an excessive harmony between the Jews and the early Christians. The alleged anachronism[6] is not calculated to strengthen the argument of our opponents, and on examination proves to be no anachronism at all.[7] *b.* As to the pretended exchange of principles in the speeches of the two apostles, the exception is wholly based on the "*a priori*" position of the critics, that the views of Peter were antagonistic to those of Paul. If the rest of Acts presents accurate history, we naturally infer that on this point, too, the author of Acts is right, and the modern critics are wrong. *c.* The methodical arrangement of Paul's speeches in Acts, according to which three fall in the period of the missionary journeys, three in the time of the captivity, and each of the three supposes a different kind of an audience, does not show lack of historical accuracy in the work, but betrays care and forethought on the part of the author. If the writer must make a

[1] *Cf.* Acts, ii., 19–36.
[2] Acts, xiv., 22, 23; xvi., 4, 5.
[3] Acts, xvii., 2–4; xviii., 7, 8; xix., 8–10.
[4] Acts, xvi., 6; xviii., 1, 5, 23; xx., 2.
[5] Acts, v., 34.
[6] Acts, v., 36, 37.
[7] Cf. Cornely, *Introd.*, iii., pp. 156, ff.

selection of material to be recorded, he is fully justified in choosing precisely those words and deeds of his hero that will represent him in the truest light. *d.* The identity of style and language throughout the work shows that the writer does not give the speeches of the apostles *verbatim*, but only in substance, so that he expressed their thoughts in his own language, just as a translator does with regard to his original text. We shall have to point out, however, that Pauline vestiges are plainly discernible in the speeches referred by Acts to the Apostle of the Gentiles. *e.* Finally, it must be remembered that, after all, the writer of Acts had as much right to determine the scope of his work and choose the material suited for his purpose as have the critics of our own day to do so for him. If he, therefore, chose to outline the propagation of Christianity from Jerusalem to Antioch, from Antioch to Rome, and did not wish to relate the minute details concerning the foundation and growth of the single churches, the modern critic ought to be thankful for what he has received, without showing his annoyance at not receiving more.

Thus far we have reviewed the principal theories concerning the authorship of the Book of Acts that destroy its historical credibility, and have examined into the main grounds on which those theories rest. We may now proceed to consider the positive evidence in favor of the historical reliability of the book, hearing first the witnesses that constitute our external evidence, and studying, in the second place, those characteristic properties of Acts that confirm, at least, the former testimony, even if they cannot establish the same truth independently. The external testimony is partly explicit in asserting the Lucan origin of Acts; partly it maintains the Lucan authorship implicitly.

"It is now generally acknowledged," says Professor Ramsay,[1] "that the tendency of the Tübingen school of criticism was to date the documents and the facts of early Christian history too late, and most recent critics have carried back the documents to an earlier date. But the question latent in their minds seems always to take the form 'How far back does clear and irrefragable evidence compel us to carry the documents?' They seem to start with the presumption of a late date in their minds, and thus always to have a certain bias, which hinders them from attaining the purely historical point of view." We need not spend much time in discussing the external evidence that dates from the end of the second century. The letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, written in or soon after 177 A.D., contains a direct reference to the dying prayer of Stephen as recorded in the Book of Acts. And

[1] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 180.

the Bishop of Lyons, who suffered martyrdom in the same persecution in which Stephen's prayer was repeated, is Photinus, the disciple and friend of Polycarp, who in his turn had been disciple and friend of the apostle St. John.[1]

Another illustrious witness belonging to the same church of Lyons we have in Irenæus. In the third book of his great work "Against the Heresies" (written about 190 A.D.), he devotes the twelfth chapter to a careful and detailed appeal to the accounts of the apostolic teaching given in the first ten chapters of Acts. The words of Stephen, of Paul, of James the Just, of Philip, and over and over again of Peter, are cited on the authority of Acts.[2] The Roman author of the Muratorian Fragment, writing about 170 A.D., gives Acts the place of honor between the four gospels and the epistles of St. Paul, and ascribes it to St. Luke; he describes the book as the "Acts of All the Apostles," perhaps to distinguish it from works such as the "Acts of John," or the "Acts of Peter and Paul."[3]

The attitude of Tertullian of Carthage, whose literary activity extended from 195 to 230 A.D., towards Acts, is unmistakable. In Oehler's edition of his works the "Scriptural Quotations" from Acts fill two columns of the Index. But there is still more definite evidence; in "De Præscript,"[4] we read: "And Christ fulfilled His promise, for the Acts of the Apostles proves that the Holy Ghost descended. But they who do not receive this Scripture can neither belong to the Holy Spirit . . . . and let not those say that they defend the Church who cannot prove when and with what swaddling clothes this body was established." In another passage,[5] after calling attention to the agreement existing between Acts and the Pauline epistles, he charges Marcion and his followers with rejecting Acts, because "the book proclaims no other God than the Creator, and the Messias of no other God than of the Creator." How could Tertullian dare to argue thus against his formidable opponent, unless the authority of Acts was acknowledged by the Church? The evidence of the West, therefore, of Rome, of Lyons, and of Carthage, is clear and decided in favor of Acts; and Alexandria in the East is equally pronounced in acknowledging the Book of Acts. We appeal to the writings of Clement of Alexandria,[6] in which we have explicit references to Acts. There are, indeed, traces of rival Acts,[7] consisting chiefly

[1] *Cf. Euseb., H. E.*, v. 2.
[2] *Cf. Iren. c. haer.*, iii., 14.
[3] *Cf. Fragm. Murat.*, lin. 34 ff.
[4] c. xxii.
[5] *Adv. Marcion*, v. 2, 3.
[6] *Paed.*, ii., 16; *Strom.*, i., 50, 89, 90, 153, 154; iv., 99, 136; v. 75, 82; vi., 63, 65.
[7] *Paed.*, ii., 16; *Strom.*, iii., 25, 26, 52; iv., 73; vii., 63; Q. D. S. 42; *Eus. H. E.*, 12; ii., 1, 9, 15.

of assertions concerning the apostles and their followers, not derived from the Acts of the Apostles; but for not one of these facts does Clement clearly indicate any written authority, and for some he clearly appeals to oral tradition,[1] so that we must conclude, that in the opinion of Clement, and in the belief of the Alexandrian Church represented by Clement, the Acts of the Apostles was without any written rival. If in later times St. Chrysostom says that many do not even know the existence of Acts, and are ignorant about its authorship,[2] or that many ascribe the authorship of Acts to Clement of Rome, to Barnabas, or Luke,[3] and if Photius repeats almost the same statements,[4] we must remember that the latter writer copies the former's homily, while Chrysostom speaks rhetorically, in order to render his audience more attentive; or, by a slip of memory, predicates of Acts what is true of the epistle to the Hebrews. The true opinion of the Father concerning the Book of Acts we find in his statement, that according to the statutes of the Fathers, the Acts of the Apostles should be read on the Feast of Pentecost.[5] Clear external evidence proves therefore that Acts was generally acknowledged and received in the Church towards the end of the second century.

Besides these clear acknowledgments of the book, we have a number of still earlier coincidences with the contents of Acts which are most satisfactorily accounted for by supposing that they are real quotations from the work of Luke. Thus Clement of Rome, writing about 93–95 A.D. to the Corinthians,[6] praises them for being "fonder of giving than receiving," just as Acts[7] reads: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Hermas, in his "Shepherd,"[8] written between 100 and 140 A.D., says that there is none other through whom we can be saved than through the great and glorious Name, and thus agrees with Acts iv., 12. Polycarp[9] chanced, between 110 and 117 A.D., upon words almost identical with those of Acts ii., 24, when he says: "Whom God raised up, having loosed the pains of Hades." Ignatius writing about the same time as Polycarp, tells[10] how our Lord after His resurrection ate and drank with His disciples—*συνπέαγεν καὶ συνέπιεν*—and thus coincides with Acts x., 41; *συνεΦάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν*, and again, he calls heretical teachers "wolves,"[11] just as they are called in Acts xx., 29. Again, Eusebius relates[12] that Dionysius of Corinth, who

[1] *Cf. The Thinker*, vol. viii., 1895, p. 14 f.
[2] In *Act. hom.*, i., 1; *cf. princ. Act. hom.*, i., 3.
[3] *Hom. in Ascens. Dom. et in princ. Act.*, ii., 8.
[4] *Cf. quæst. ad Amphil.*, 123, al. 145.
[5] In princ. Act, hom., iv., 3.
[6] C., ii.
[7] xx., 35.
[8] Vis., iv., 2.
[9] Ad Philipp.,
[10] Ad Smyrn., iii.
[11] Ad Philadelph., ii.
[12] H. E., iv., 29.

wrote about 170 A.D., recorded that Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted by Paul the Apostle, according to the account given in Acts, was the first bishop of Athens. In like manner does Papias,[1] who wrote between 140 and 160 A.D., mention Justus, surnamed Barsabas, and differ in his account of the death of Judas from that in the first gospel. In the first point we have a coincidence with Acts i., 23, and the divergence from the first gospel would have hardly found its way into the writing of the author, if he had not read a modified account in a source equal in authority with the first gospel. In order to appreciate the foregoing coincidences at their true value, we must keep in mind the following considerations: (1) It is more important for an opponent of the Lucan authorship of Acts to impugn these early quotations than it is for us to maintain them, for the admission of a single one destroys the position of the critic, while the surrender of all would leave our position intact. (2) The strength of the argument does not rest on the coincidences taken singly but collectively; singly they might be accounted for as proceeding from a source different from Acts, but collectively they are more naturally explained by accepting the traditional view of the authorship of Acts. (3) The authorship of a classical work would be considered as established beyond all cavil by one-tenth of the evidence we have adduced for the authorship of Acts. Why, then, should there be doubt concerning the value of our argument?

The testimony of external evidence in favor of the Lucan origin of Acts is fully confirmed by internal evidence. For the nature and contents of Acts distinguish the book from all pseudo-canonical literature, demand an author contemporary with the history told in Acts, familiar with the language of St, Paul, and identical with Luke himself.

The first of these assertions is fully borne out by a comparison of Acts with any one of the apocrypha. The Acts of Thomas, *e.g.*, knows of the apostle's miraculous power over wild asses that knelt around the conveyance in which he and his companion, a Christian soldier, journeyed through India, and that compelled the four strongest of the herd to draw the carriage. The Acts of John tells of the apostle's power over bedbugs that molested him in an inn on his way to Ephesus. During the night the unwelcome visitors were bidden to leave the house, and in the morning were permitted to return to their respective quarters from the threshold of the house near which they had been obliged to spend the night. Again, according to the apocrypha, Peter drives a

[1] *Cf.* Euseb. H. E., iii., 39.

camel carrying a person of ill-repute through the eye of an needle, in order to prove that it is easier for a camel to pass through such a strait than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. It will be remembered that Peter had been ridiculed and even maltreated by a well-to-do listener for preaching this doctrine.[1] Comparing the sober historical tone of our Acts with such extravagances abounding in all the apocrypha, we must grant the existence of a vast difference between our canonical book and its pseudo-canonical rivals.

Secondly, we maintain that internal evidence demands for Acts an author contemporary with its history. To prove this we must show that the geographical and historical information contained in the book is so accurate that only a contemporary writer can have furnished it. Several of the details we are about to enumerate are well known to the reader, but we draw attention to them in order to extend our observation of the writer's accuracy over the whole of his work. Thus Acts, i., 12, gives the distance of Mount Olivet from Jerusalem with exact truthfulness. Acts, iii., 2, mentions "the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful," a name that is accounted for by Josephus.[2] Acts, iv., 6, "Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest" contradicts at first sight Josephus,[3] who testifies that Annas was high priest only from 6 to 15 A.D. But the passage agrees with Lk., iii., 2, John, xviii., 13–24, and, in fact, with Josephus himself, who calls "high priest" not only the actual incumbent, but all who have held the post.[4] Repeatedly the title is given by Josephus to persons that do not appear on the list of high priests at all,[5] so that he applies it not only to actual high priests and ex-high priests, but also to the heads of the privileged families from which those dignitaries were commonly chosen. It is in this wide meaning of the words that in Acts, xix., 14, "Sceva, a Jew, a chief priest," is mentioned in exact accordance with the parlance of Palestine which became, later on, so uncommon that it gave difficulty to the most learned of commentators. Acts, v., 36, mentions a Theudas different from the pretender mentioned by Josephus;[6] the latter rose up in the procuratorship of Fadus at least twelve years later than the former, and had a very great multitude of followers, while the adherents of

[1] Cf. Holtzmann, *Handcomm.*, p. 307 f.

[2] B. J. V., v., 3.

[3] Ant. XVIII., ii., 1, 2; *cf.* XX., ix., 1; B. J. V., xii., 3.

[4] B. J. II., xii., 6; Vit., 38; B. J., IV., iii., 7; IV.. iv., 3; IV., iii., 9; *cf.* Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II., ii., pp. 202 ff.

[5] *Cf.* Jos. B. J. II., xx., 4; Vit., 39; B. J., IV., ix., 11; V., xiii., 1; VI., ii., 2; Schürer, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1872, p. 639.

[6] Ant. XX., v., 1.

the former amounted only to about four hundred. But Josephus himself[1] testifies that in the last year of Herod the Great, in which the Theudas of Acts must have exercised his influence, there were three insurrections beside several pretenders to royalty. If the Book of Acts had been composed by a writer posterior to the events he relates, we should naturally expect to find in it a closer agreement with the sources from which the author would have had to borrow in that case. And this the more, because in the very next verse, Acts, v., 37, we find an exact agreement between the canonical book and Josephus.[2] For Josephus testifies that Judas of Galilee was so designated from the scene of his insurrection, and that he was called a Gaulonite from the district in which was his birthplace. Acts, viii., 26, reads: "The way that goeth down from Jerusalem into Gaza, this is desert;" first, the clause "this is desert" refers to "way," not to "Gaza;" secondly, since several ways lead from "Jerusalem into Gaza," the addition is not idle, but determines one particular road; finally, the description given of this road by modern travellers confirms the accuracy of Acts: "the road from Jerusalem strikes into this wady at its worst part, and if this be the route taken by St. Philip the Evangelist, when he fell in with the eunuch, I don't wonder at the statement that it was "desert."[3] The famine predicted by Agabus in Acts, xi., 28, agrees with what Suetonius[4] relates of the famine which raged in the reign of Claudius throughout the Roman provinces, in some more intensely, in others less, and which between 44 and 48 A.D. made itself felt in Palestine more than anywhere else, as is attested by Josephus.[5] Again, the incidents related in Acts, xii., 1 ff., are in strict accord with profane history: That Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, son of Aristobulus, and nephew of Herod Antipas, was king of Palestine about 42 A.D., is attested by Josephus;[6] Agrippa's wish to please the Jews, expressed in Acts, xii., 3, is also confirmed by Josephus;[7] the manner of Peter's imprisonment described in Acts, xii., 4 f., agrees with the statement of Suetonius[8] and Tacitus;[9] the picture of Agrippa's death found in Acts, xii., 20–23, has its counterpart in Josephus.[10] Nor can it be said that Acts, xii., 1 ff., disagrees with what is said by Josephus of Agrippa's clemency,[11] and of the pro-

[1] Ant. XVII., x., 4–8.

[2] Ant. XVIII., i., 6; XX., v., 2; B. J., II., viii., 1; *cf.* Orig. c. Cels., i. 57; hom. in Luc., xxv.

[3] Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, N. Y., 1888, p. 195.

[4] *Vita Claudii*, c., xviii.; *cf.* Dio Cassius, *Hist*, lx., 11.

[5] Ant. XX., ii., 6; v. 2; *cf.* Eus. H. E., II., 11, 3; Tacit. *Annal.*, xiii., 43.

[6] Ant. XIX., vi., 1 ff.

[7] Ant. XIX., vii., 3, 5.

[8] Dom., 14.

[9] *Hist.*, iv., 11.

[10] Ant. XIX., viii., 2.

[11] Ant. XIX., vii., 3.

tection that Christians found among the Jerusalem Pharisees ;[1] for according to the former passage Agrippa directs his clemency wholly to the acquisition of popular favor, and according to the latter the citizens of Jerusalem protest against Annas's manner of acting through fear of countenancing lawless tyranny, and not through any esteem for Christianity. When we come to the missionary journeys of the apostle Paul related in Acts, xiii., 1–xiv., 28 ; xv., 40–xviii., 22 ; xviii., 23–xxi., 18, the historical record of our canonical book is attested by most reliable evidence.[2] Acts, xiii., 2, "for the work whereunto I have called them" agrees with Gal., i., 15, 16. In order to leave Syria, Paul and his companions had to go first to Seleucia ; nothing of permanent interest occurred till they came to Paphos, where the mention of the "proconsul Sergius Paulus," in Acts, xiii., 6, 7, gave considerable difficulty to former commentators. For in the first place the title "proconsul" appeared to be restricted to ex-consuls, whose number was exhausted by the most remunerative provinces of the empire, so that Cyprus could not claim a proconsul for its political head ; secondly, according to Strabo,[3] only the provinces of Asia and Africa were governed by a proconsul, while all the other provinces had prætors ; thirdly, the name Sergius Paulus appeared to be unknown in all historical records. Our reader must allow us to explain this point more fully.

It has been pointed out by Lightfoot[4] that after Augustus had divided the provinces under the Roman dominion with the senate, and thus created a set of imperial provinces and another of senatorial, the rulers of the latter were called "proconsuls"—*ἀνθύπατοι* —and those of the former "proprætors"—*ἀντιστράτηγοι*—or "legates"—*πρεσβευταί*—so that "proconsul" and "proprætor" were then employed to distinguish the superior power under which the provinces were administered without regard for the previous rank of the governors administering them. This will satisfy the first of the foregoing difficulties. The second has been answered just as satisfactorily by the same writer ; the original subdivision of the provinces between the emperor and the senate underwent constant modifications according to the conditions of the country. Whenever miiltary rule was necessary, the province was transferred to the emperor as the head of the army, and the senate received an imperial province in exchange. Dio Cassius agrees with Strabo in recording that at the original distribution of provinces[5] Cyprus

---

[1] Ant. XX., ix., 1.

[2] *Cf.* Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 16–96.

[3] xvii., p. 840

[4] *Contemporary Review*, May, 1878, or, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, London, 1889, appendix.

[5] B.C., 27.

had fallen to the emperor's share, but the historian adds that later on[1] the emperor gave back Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis to the senate, himself taking Dalmatia in exchange.[2] The continuance of Cyprus under the jurisdiction of the senate about the time of St. Luke's narrative follows from inscriptional mention of the names of two proconsuls who governed the province in Claudius's time,[3] and from the numismatic record of a third and perhaps a fourth.[4] And though in Hadrian's time we come across a proprætor in Cyprus,[5] probably owing to the disturbed state of the province consequent on the insurrection of the Jews, still under Severus, at the close of the same century, 198 A.D., the island is again governed according to its normal condition by a proconsul.[6] The writer of Acts is therefore historically accurate on a point on which only a contemporary can be expected to be perfectly truthful. One of General Cesnola's inscriptions[7] has supplied the defect of historical record of the Sergius Paulus mentioned by Luke. In spite of its mutilated condition it contains the date ἐπὶ *Παυλου* [*ἀνθ*]*υπατου*, *i.e.*, "in the proconsulship of Paulus." The omission of "Sergius" occurs also in the case of the only other Sergius Paulus known to history,[8] who lived in the time of Galen the physician (about 160 A.D.), just as the Paulus of Cesnola's inscription lived in the time of Luke the physician. Considering, then, that the author of Acts has proved to be historically correct on points that have exercised some of the most experienced historians for centuries, we must naturally conclude that he related in Acts contemporary history.

Not to insist on the agreement of the picture drawn in Acts, xv., 3, with the old custom of accompanying friends for a part of their journey and also with the apostle's route through "Phenice and Samaria," we must emphasize the language of Acts, xvi., 12, "and from thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of part of Macedonia, a colony." Here various interpreters have pointed out various ways of agreement. 1. According to the Greek text we read the "first city" instead of "chief city," and Philippi was, in fact, the first city of Macedonia one entered on coming from Samothracia, since Neapolis was situated in Thrace.[9] 2. Meyer-Wendt, Overbeck and Holtzman call attention to the fact that, according to Dio Cassius,[10] it was to Philippi that, in 42 B.C., Augustus trans-

[1] liii., 12; liv., 4. [2] B. C. 22.

[3] A.D., 51, 52; *cf.* Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr. Græc.*, 2631, 2632; the names of the proconsuls are Q. Julius Cordus and L. Annius Bassus.

[4] Cominius Proclus, and perhaps Quadratus; *cf. Akerman's Numismatic Illustrations of the New Testament*, p. 39.

[5] *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, iii., 6072. [6] *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, iii., 218.

[7] *Cf.* Cesnola's *Cyprus*, p. 425. [8] *Cf.* Galen, *De Prænot.*, 2.

[9] Kaulen, *Einl.*, p. 454; Pauli, *Realencycl.*, v. 487, Lightfoot. [10] li., 4.

planted the adherents of Antonius, endowing the colony with the "ius Italicum;" hence they interpret the foregoing verse "which is the first colony-city of the province of Macedonia" (or, "of a district of Macedonia"). 3. Ramsay[1] expresses the belief that in Acts, xvi., 12, we receive "an addition to our knowledge of Macedonia;" for though, at present, we have no other external evidence for the fact, the learned author infers from this passage of Acts that in the first century the province Macedonia was divided into districts, and that Philippi was capital of one of these districts. 4. Hort has ventured the conjecture that we ought to read πιεριδος instead of μεριδος, but is wrong in contending that μερις is not used of the division of a province, since in Egypt, at least, the word is a technical term in the sense of subdivision of a large district. And even if the original subdivision of Macedonia into four districts was obsolete in the first century,[2] another division must have come into use. 5. We hardly need add another explanation according to which the author of Acts calls Philippi merely one of the principal cities, a colony, in Macedonia.

In Acts, xvi., 14, "a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira," agrees both with the circumstance that Thyatira was located in the province Lydia,[3] and that Lydia was renowned for its traffic in purple, a reputation it maintains even to-day by its weekly export of scarlet cloth to Smyrna. The curiosity of the Athenians mentioned in Acts, xvii., 21, is attested by Aelian,[4] Demosthenes[5] and Thucydides.[6] Their superstition, reproved in Acts, xvii., 22, may be inferred from Pausanias,[7] Aelian[8] and Josephus.[9] Altars to unknown gods in the city, referred to in Acts, xvii. 23, are mentioned also by Pausanias,[10] Philostratus[11] and Diogenes Laertius.[12] The exile of the Jews from Rome in the time of Claudius, alluded to in Acts, xviii. 2, is told by Suetonius:[13] "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit." The law must have been antiquated even in the time of Nero, as may be inferred from Acts, xxviii., 17–29. Junius Annæus Gallio, mentioned in Acts, xviii., 12, was the brother of the philosopher Seneca, and adoptive son of the rhetorician, L. Junius Gallio. His spirit of moderation, exhibited in the case of St. Paul, agrees with his description by profane authors.[14] Paul's protest against being scourged uncondemned, related in Acts, xxii., 25, agrees with the "lex Valeria de provocatione,[15] and the

[1] *Cf. The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158.
[2] *Cf.* Leake, *Northern Greece*, iii., p. 487.
[3] *Cf.* Apoc., ii., 18.
[4] V. H., v. 13.
[5] Phil., i., 4.
[6] III., xxxviii., 4.
[7] I., xxiv., 3.
[8] V. H., v. 17.
[9] Ap., ii., 11.
[10] I., i., 4.
[11] Apoll., vi., 2.
[12] Epim., 31.
[13] Claud., 25.
[14] L. Ann. Senecæ, *Nat. Quæst.*, 4, præf., 9.; Tacit, *Ann.*, xv., 73; xvi., 17; Stat. Silv., ii., 7, 32.
[15] *Cf.* Cic. Verr., v. 56, 62, 64.

"lex Portia,"[1] and also with Cicero's well-known expressions:[2] "Facinus est vinciri civem romanum, scelus verberari, parricidium necari." According to Acts, xxiii., 3,[3] the high priest Ananias commands that Paul be struck on the mouth; now, according to Josephus,[4] Ananias held office at this precise time, and distinguished himself for avarice and quarrelsomeness.[5] That Cæsarea in Palestine was the seat of the Roman governor, as is stated in Acts, xxiii., 23, is confirmed by Tacitus.[6] The city had been built by Herod the Great in place of the old Straton-tower, so that its situation fitted it especially for the residence of the procurator. The legal pleader we meet in Acts, xxiv., 1, is in keeping with the custom of those times to employ such orators;[7] his name, Tertullus, appears to have been frequent among lawyers.[8] Tacitus[9] writes of Felix, the Roman procurator: "Per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem ius regium servili ingenio exercuit," so that he confirms Acts, xxiv., 24, according to which Felix, the second husband of his third wife, Drusilla, who was the daughter of Herod Agrippa and the faithless wife of a king of Emesa,[10] came with his consort into Paul's prison, "and as he treated of justice and chastity, and of the judgment to come, Felix, being terrified, answered: For this time go thy way; but when I have convenient time, I will send for thee." Again, according to Acts, xxiv., 26, Felix hoped "that money should be given him by Paul," and according to Tacitus,[11] "Felix cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus," while Josephus[12] testifies that after the departure of Felix the Jews accused him of injustice and tyranny. That Acts, xxiv., 27; xxv., 1, is right in naming Festus as the successor of Felix, and in stating that Festus visited Jerusalem soon after his installation, may be learned from Josephus.[13] Since about this time the Jewish revolution was near at hand, the statement of Acts, xxv., 9, that the new procurator, in spite of his integrity, sought to gain the good-will of the people, cannot astonish us. According to Acts, xxv., 13, Herod Agrippa II., the son of Agrippa I., is accompanied by his sister Berenice. Their well-known criminal relations find a scourge in the Roman satyrist Juvenal.[14] Berenice is rather famous for her dishonorable conduct. She became later on the favorite of the Emperor Titus. The voyage of the captive Paul from Cæsarea to Rome is so accurately described in Acts, xxvii., 4–xxviii., 15, that even Holtzmann finds in it the apostle's own

[1] Liv., x., 9; Gell., x., 3.
[2] Verr., v. 66.
[3] *Cf.* xxiv., 1.
[4] *Ant.*, XX., v., 2 ff.
[5] *Ant.*, XX., ix., 2.
[6] Hist., ii., 79.
[7] Ael, V. H., ix., 19.
[8] Plin., ep., ix., 13; Suet., *Tit.*, 4.
[9] *Hist.*, v., 9.
[10] *Cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, XIX., ix., 1; XX., vii., 2.
[11] *Ann.*, xii., 54.
[12] *Ant.*, XX., viii., 9.
[13] *Ant.*, XX., viii., 9; ix., 1; B. J., II., xiv., 1.
[14] Sat., vi., 156–160.

account, excepting, however, Paul's address to his fellow-passengers, which the foregoing writer ascribes as to both its matter and form to the author of Acts. Finally, the description of Paul's captivity in Rome, given in Acts, xxviii., 16 ff., agrees exactly with what we read in Cicero[1] and Tacitus.[2] It cannot be maintained that this geographical and historical accuracy of Acts is owing to the scientific study of the author of Acts, for if it has taken the learned men of our day so long to verify the statements of the book, how can we expect that a writer of the unscientific post-apostolic age should have succeeded in attaining such pre-eminent historical accuracy? Nor can it be maintained that the author of Acts wrote after the time of the apostles, but used documents of the apostolic age, for how can our opponents admit several apostolic writers for whose existence they have no proof, and whose literary products have left no trace of their existence, while they repudiate the contemporary author of Acts against the unanimous testimony of all tradition and against the evident exigencies of the Book of Acts itself?

Thus far it has been shown from internal evidence that the author of Acts differs vastly from the authors of the apocrypha, and, secondly, that the author of Acts belongs to the apostolic age. We are now going to show in the same manner that the writer of Acts must have belonged to the companions of the apostle Paul. The vocabulary of Paul's speeches in the Acts has been compared with that of Paul's epistles, and after giving a list of remarkable coincidences, Davidson,[3] unfriendly critic as he is, concludes: "These may show nothing more than a writer familiar with the Pauline diction, as the author of the Acts undoubtedly was." But then the Pauline speeches of Acts are said to contain also many of Luke's favorite words. Alford has remarked that the speech in Acts xxii., which was spoken in Hebrew, contains no Pauline expression, while it abounds in those peculiar to Luke; while the speech reported in Acts xvii., which Luke does not profess to have heard himself, contains none of Luke's peculiar phrases. Davidson[4] says of the latter: "It must be confessed, however, that the discourse contains many peculiar expressions, there being no less than twenty-six words in 19–34 which do not occur in Luke."

Returning now to the unwilling admission that the writer of Acts was "undoubtedly familiar with the Pauline diction," we ask how he acquired that familiarity? If he did not acquire it by personal intercourse with the apostle, it must have been the fruit of his diligent study of the Pauline epistles. Now, to use our

---

[1] In *Vat.*, 9.
[2] *Ann.*, ii., 31.
[3] ii., 112.
[4] ii., 109.

opponents' language, the author of Acts "knew nothing" of these letters. If the antiquity of the Book of Acts were undoubted, and that of the Pauline epistles disputed, our opponents would not admit the validity of a single proof we could produce that the author of Acts was acquainted with the epistles, while they could make out a strong case to prove his ignorance. There is not a word in Acts about Epaphroditus—*e.g.*, about the women Euodia and Syntyche, about the name Clement, about the gift of money sent by the Philippian church to Paul at Thessalonica, though all of these are mentioned in the epistle to the Philippians,[1] and would have well fitted into the history told in Acts. We have already seen that Acts contains not only no special coincidences with the epistle to the Galatians, but that our opponents advance a number of discrepancies between the two in order to destroy the historical credibility of the Book of Acts. If the author of Acts had known the first epistle to the Corinthians, he probably would have told something of the Lord's appearance to James[2] and to the five hundred brethren at once; similarly, if he had read the second epistle to the same church, he would have mentioned the five times when Paul received in the synagogue forty stripes save one, and his three beatings with rods, and his three shipwrecks.[3] Not to carry our minute observations through the epistles of Paul singly, we may state two general conclusions: First, the Book of Acts says nothing about the Pauline epistles, which would certainly be a most singular omission in the history of Paul, if his letters had been in general circulation when the compiler of Acts wrote his work. Secondly, the Book of Acts not only does not mention Paul's epistles, but shows, at best, a very scanty acquaintance with them. It follows, then, that the author of Acts did not acquire his undoubted familiarity with the Pauline diction from a study of the Pauline epistles, and that he must, therefore, have derived the same from personal intercourse with the apostle.[4]

The same result we obtain by another consideration.[5] The reader is already familiar with the fact that in the so-called we-sections of Acts the writer speaks in the first person, as if he himself had been present at the particular events he relates in these portions. These we-sections are Acts xvi., 10–17; xx., 5–15; xxi., 1–18; xxvii., 1–xxviii., 16. Accordingly, the author represents himself as having joined Paul at Troas and accompanied him to Philippi. There he remains; for when Paul leaves Philippi the "we" ceases, and is not resumed till Paul returns to Philippi,

[1] Phil., ii., 25; iv., 2, 3, 16. [2] 1 Cor. xv., 6, 7. [3] II. Cor., xi., 24.
[4] Cf. Salmon, *Introduction to the New Testament*, London, 1889, pp. 342–347.
[5] Cf. Salmon, l. c., pp. 320–329.

some six or seven years later. Then it begins again, and continues till the apostle's arrival in Jerusalem.[1] It begins again in chapter xxvii. with Paul's voyage from Cæsarea, and continues till his arrival in Rome.[2] In Codex D the tradition that the author of Acts was of Antioch is attested by the insertion of "we" in Acts xi., 28, for the prophecy of Agabus is described as having taken place "when we were gathered together." Now, it must be kept in mind that the "we" is not a merely artificial introduction into the text of Acts. For one of our unfriendly opponents, Davidson,[3] says that the we-sections are "characterized by a circumstantiality of detail, a vividness of description, an exact knowledge of localities, an acquaintance with the phrases and habits of seamen, which betray one who was personally present." Secondly, it must also be kept in mind that the author of the we-sections is identical with the author of the other parts of the Book of Acts. For this, too, we appeal to the testimony of the critics. Davidson[4] says: "From these linguistic and other phenomena it is clear that the writer of the book was not a mere compiler, but an author. If he used materials, he did not put them together so loosely as to leave their language and style in the state he got them, but wrought up the component parts into a work having its own characteristics." If, therefore, the author of Acts were distinct from the author of the we-sections, he would have changed the "we" into the third person, to make it agree with the rest of the work. Renan agrees with the conclusion here expressed.[5] He considers the oversight on the part of the compiler of Acts to leave unchanged the "we" of a document written by another author as altogether inexplicable, considering the care he has bestowed on the rest of his work. Finally, Overbeck, in the preface to his edition of De Wette's "Handbook on Acts," has decisively proved that the we-sections as they stand now are so full of the characteristics of the author of the rest of the book that the hypothesis of their being borrowed from another is not tenable, unless we go to the length of contending that the borrower interpolated them with much of his own, and that in these interpolations he dishonestly used the pronoun "we." The author of the we-sections, therefore, was a companion of the apostle in the events related in those portions. But the author of the we-sections is identical with the author of the Book of Acts. Therefore, the author of the Book of Acts was a companion of St. Paul.

Internal evidence proves furthermore that the companion of St. Paul, who wrote the Book of Acts, was no one else but St. Luke.

---

[1] Acts xx., 5–xxi., 18. [2] Acts xxviii., 16.
[3] ii., 136. [4] ii., 145. [5] *Les Apôtres*, xi.

According to the foregoing explanations, the presence of the author at the incidents related in Acts betrays itself by the use of the pronoun "we." Hence Sopater[1], Aristarchus[2], Secundus[3], Tychicus, Trophimus[4], and Caius[5] are excluded from the authorship of the book, because the writer of Acts speaks of them in the third person. Though there might, at first sight, be more difficulty about Timothy and Silas, still a reference to Acts xvi., 19, 25, 29; xvii., 4, 10, 14, 15; xviii., 5, excludes these also from the authorship, since the "we" is wanting in the foregoing passages, though either Silas or Timothy or both are present at the events narrated therein. Hence only Titus and Luke are left as the possible authors of Acts. Again, Titus is excluded, because we know, from Gal., ii., 1, 2, that he was present at the events narrated in Acts xv., 1, 2, and still there is no "we;" besides, Titus was most probably not at Philippi when the author of Acts uses "we" concerning events which occurred in that city. Thus internal evidence determines not only that the writer of Acts is different from the writers of the apocrypha, that he lived in the apostolic age, that he was a companion of Paul, but it points also to St. Luke with unmistakable precision.

Finally, a word about the theory of Blass, that Luke wrote not only one, but two copies of the Book of Acts. The main argument of the writer is based on the existence of the so-called Western or Roman text of Acts which is so different from the Eastern text, that it produces the impression of a different edition of the work. The reader must keep in mind that the chief authorities for the Western text are the Codex Bezæ [D], the Codex Laudianus [E], the Codex Mediolanensis [M, or 137 in Tischendorf's notation], the Latin part of Codex Bezæ [d], the Latin part of Codex Laudianus [e], the Latin palimpsest Floriacensis [f], the "gigas librorum" [g], now in Stockholm; the Codex 321 of Paris [p], the Codex Wernigerodiensis [w], the Provençal translation made from the Latin in the thirteenth century and published in 1887 [Prov], some passages in Augustine [a], the readings from a manuscript similar to the Codex Bezæ inserted in the text and margin of the Harkleian edition of the Philoxenian Syriac [s], the Sahidic version [sah], citations in Cyprian [Cypr] and Augustine [Aug], as well as in Ireneaus [Ir]. The great bulk of codices, versions and patristic citations and passages give the Eastern text. Beside the indubitable existence of a class of readings so different from the commonly received reading that they have the appearance of a different edition, there is also the circumstance that

---

[1] Acts, xx., 4. [2] Acts, xix., 29. [3] Acts, xx., 4.
[4] Acts, xx., 4. [5] Acts, xix., 29.

the so-called Western or Roman text is, at times, distinguished for its minute accuracy and truthfulness, so that its variations from the common text cannot be the work of casual mistakes of the transcribers. In the third place, Nestle[1] has pointed out that in some instances the Western text of Acts differs from the Eastern, just as two different translations of the same Hebrew or Aramaic text would be likely to differ from one another; the existence of the two texts would therefore be fully explained by the hypothesis that Luke translated his original Aramaic document twice; first in a more lengthy manner, and then more briefly. The first, or rough copy, remained in Rome, becoming the source of the Western or Roman text; the second copy was sent to Theophilus at Antioch, thus becoming the source of the Eastern text of Acts. In the fourth place, Blass himself appealed to certain parts of Demosthenes edited twice by the author, in order to show that such repeated editions of the same work by the original writer are not unknown in classical literature. Dræseke[2] added another, doubtful, instance of a second edition of the same work by a Byzantine writer on Basil, Gregory and Chrysostom, and Zöckler[3] brought forward five more cases of the same practice.[4] Finally, Conybeare[5] has shown that the Western text of Acts was the basis of an early commentary to which, in some form, both Chrysostom and Ephrem had access, so as to use it in their respective commentaries on Acts.

If we now examine these arguments as to their solidity, we shall find that they are more pretentious than convincing. As to Conybeare's article, we may here grant, for argument's sake, that it proves what it intends to establish; but since we fully grant that Western readings of Acts were known in the church about a century or more before the time of either Chrysostom or Ephrem, the use made of them by the two Fathers proves nothing in favor of a double Lucan edition of Acts. Nor can this be said to rest on the fact that several writers of the early age edited their works twice or three times[6]; at best, the latter circumstance shows the possibility of a double Lucan edition of Acts on the supposition that Luke wrote just as the alleged writers did write. We do not intend here to deny the possibility of a double edition of his work

---

[1] *Philologica Sacra*, Berlin, 1896, pp. 39 ff.

[2] "Zur Überlieferung," d. Ag., *Hilg. Ztschr.*, xxxvii., p. 194.

[3] *Studia Gryphiswaldensia*, 1895, p. 132 ff.

[4] Tert., *Adv. Marc.*; Eus., περὶ τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μαρτυρησάντων; Pasch. Radb., *De Corpore et Sanguine Dni.*; Apollod., χρονικῶν; Longin., Ἀττικ ὧν ὀνομάτων ἐκδόσεις δύο; *Cf.* Schanz, *Hist. Litt. Rom.*, iii., 374, 387; Diels, *Mas. Rhen.*, xxxi., 8, 54.

[5] *The American Journal of Philology*, 1896, July, p. 135 ff.

[6] Tert., *Adv. Marc.*

on the part of an inspired writer,[1] but we deny that we can logically infer the possibility of a double edition of an *inspired* work from the fact of such a double edition of a work that is *not inspired*. As to Nestle's contention that the Western and Eastern texts of Acts differ just as two successive translations of the same original Hebrew or Aramaic text would be likely to differ, we find only two words given to establish this sweeping statement.[2] Now, in the first place, it would be quite easy to find many more than two words of the Western and Eastern text of Acts respectively, that might in the same manner appear to be two successive translations of a Latin or an English original text, and it would be folly to infer from this that Luke translated Acts originally from a Latin or an English document, and that he corrected his first version in a second edition. In the second place, the instances adduced by Nestle are on inspection no instances at all, for in both the writer is obliged to suppose two different words even in his original Hebrew or Aramaic text in order to account for the two different readings in the Greek text. The alleged minute accuracies of the Codex Bezæ, the principal source of the Western or Roman text of Acts, are offset by almost innumerable readings in the same Codex that must be rejected as false. After discussing the readings of Codex Bezæ at some length, Ramsay[3] concludes that some, at least, of the alterations in Codex Bezæ arose through a gradual process, and not through the action of an individual reviser. "Possibly all the changes," the writer says, "which have been discussed in the preceding pages may have arisen in this way. But some of them are perhaps more naturally explained as the work of a single individual, whom I shall speak of as the 'reviser.'"[4] If the existence of a double text of an inspired book, such as we have in the case of Acts, be a solid argument for a double edition of the book, we must admit a double edition not only of Acts, but also of the gospels, since Codex Bezæ, the principal source of the Western text, contains the gospels too. We doubt greatly whether Prof. Blass himself is prepared to extend his inference to this length.

If we, therefore, survey the opinions expressed by the critics of the last fifty years concerning the authorship of Acts, we find that they are not only opposed to, but also destructive of one another. On the one hand, it is contended that Luke did not write Acts;

[1] The first gospel, *e.g.*, may have been written in Hebrew by the evangelist and then translated into Greek by the author himself, or at least under his immediate supervision.

[2] Acts, ii., 47; iii., 31.

[3] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 151 ff.

[4] The reviser must have lived before 150–160 A.D., and been more familiar with the conditions of Asia Minor than of Europe.

on the other, it is maintained that Luke wrote Acts twice over; on the one hand, it is stated that no apostolic writer can be admitted as the author of Acts; on the other, it is shown that there must have been several apostolic writers who composed the different parts of Acts. By the light of this sad manifestation of human weakness and fallibility we are led to appreciate the simplicity and sufficiency of the traditional view, that St. Luke composed Acts partly from his own notes, partly from information derived from others, "according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses" (Lk., i., 2).

A. J. Maas, S.J.

Woodstock, Md.

LACORDAIRE AND LAMENNAIS.

THE most peculiar and most attractive personage whom history can discover, an impassioned friend of the nineteenth century, "in the very depths of whose bowels he was born,"[1] and, nevertheless, a submissive conquest of the faith to which he afterward subjugated so many happy souls, Lacordaire was, of all the public men of our day, the most striking instance of what Catholicism can do for the natural man. Passionately devoted to liberty in a society which was too apt to confound that sacred gift with unbridled license, Lacordaire was saved by his Catholicism from a plunge into the gulf of anarchy. Endowed with a subtlety of imagination which is rarely given to man, he would have conceived arguments for any and every attractive theory, and would have wandered into the paths of intellectual and spiritual darkness, had he not been guided by the Star of Bethlehem. But because he was Catholic to the core, the quondam disciple of the mutilated Titan, Lamennais, bowed before the decision of the Chair of Peter; the editor of "L'Avenir" transferred his logic and his eloquence to the pulpit of Notre Dame; the Christian liberal of 1848 preserved his honor and his true liberty by abandoning the Constituent Assembly of the Second Republic; and finally, just as in 1832 he had said that "he departed from Rome free and victorious," so at the end of his career he was able to proclaim that "the Catholic Church is the liberatrix of the human mind." Catholic in every pulsation of his heart, in every

[1] Montalembert on Lacordaire.

conception of his mind, he could love men without loving the world; human respect, that most powerful obstacle to the propagation of every kind of truth, was conquered by him on the day when he bent to the yoke of Christ; and therefore no man, better than Lacordaire, could effect that work for which he was pre-eminently distinguished—the infusion of shame for their cowardice into the hearts of those children of the Revolution who dreaded to be seen entering into a church. "Lacordaire caused these disciples of Voltaire to make the sign of the cross like Marceau, and to communicate with Paqueron and Ozanam."[1] He knew how to reach the hearts, to illumine the intellects of the devotees of that false liberalism which Montalembert has so thoroughly revealed to us. And yet this orator and polemic, who reminds us of Bossuet; this tribune and political leader, who seemed to be another O'Connell; this priest and ascetic, who stands forth among the living and dead of the nineteenth century as the most perfect embodiment of the spirit of St. Dominic, had himself drunk deeply of the poisoned waters of that bastard liberalism.

His widowed mother, a strong and courageous Christian, had transmitted and developed her own characteristics in her four sons; and while he was still a child, the favorite recreation of little Henri was to preach some juvenile attempts at sermons to a congregation composed of his nurse and playmates. But when, after a sojourn of seven years at the State Lycée of Dijon, her boys returned to her maternal embraces, Mme. Lacordaire found that not one of them could join in her prayers. The future *conferencier* of Notre Dame says in his "Mémoires": "When seventeen years old, I left college with my religion destroyed . . . . holding before my eyes, as the luminary of my life, the human ideal of glory. And this result is easily explained. We had lived continually, during the course of our education, surrounded by the examples of ancient heroism and by the masterpieces of antiquity; and nothing had supported our faith while following a system in which the divine word gave forth only an indistinct sound, without eloquence and without consequences." In fine, the yoke of the University of that day was on the young Lacordaire; like all his professors, he cherished the vague reveries of Deism, and breathed the miasma of Voltarian skepticism.

Shortly after his admittance to the bar, Lacordaire, then only twenty-two years of age, attained to such distinction that the great Berryer predicted to him: "It is in your power to reach the highest rank in our profession." And the president, Séguier, remarked, after listening to one of his pleadings: "Gentlemen, it is

[1] Pellissier, *Les Gloires de la France Chrêtienne*, p. 239; Paris, 1890.

not Patru that we have heard, but Bossuet." But at this very time, amid the whisperings of ambition, and in spite of the sentimental Deism of Rousseau, which he had brought from the University, Lacordaire had begun to apprehend that truth which illumined the old age of Chateaubriand: "The Christian idea is the future of the world. Far from having arrived at its end, the religion of the Saviour has scarcely entered on its third period—the political one. Although immovable in its dogmas, Christianity is mobile in the light that it sheds; its transformation involves a general transformation."[1] In 1824 he was able to write to a friend: "It is strange, indeed, how my views have changed. Never was I more of a philosopher than I am at present; but I believe more and more. . . . . We can reach Christianity by all sorts of roads; for it is the centre of all truths." Great was the surprise of M. Guillemin, the advocate to whom Lacordaire had brought letters of introduction when he arrived in Paris, when he heard that the priesthood was the great hope of the young man who but a year before had scorned the idea of going to confession. Mgr. de Quélen, the Archbishop of Paris, was also surprised when the brilliant young lawyer requested him to procure his admission into the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice. "Gladly," replied the prelate: "you have defended perishable interests at the bar; now you shall defend those which are eternal."

From the moment of his entrance into the seminary, Lacordaire kept ever present before his mind, as he himself tells us, the great object of his life and the great obstacle which he would probably encounter: "My object is to make Jesus Christ known to those who now know Him not; the obstacle will be a desire to have men talk about me." The directors of Saint-Sulpice tested the vocation of their brilliant candidate to the utmost, and deferred his ordination long beyond the customary term; but his humility stood the proof, and shortly after his ascent to the altar he gave a good indication of the spirit which animated him. One of his superiors, the Abbé Boyer, persuaded that he would effect more good in a position where his legal abilities and his knowledge of the world would be called into play, thus playfully addressed him: "Sit down; I am about to make a cardinal of you." Then the abbé told his late disciple that he had besought the royal Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs (Mgr. de Frayssinous), who had the right of appointment, to confer upon the young priest an auditorship of the Roman *Ruota*, which was then vacant. Such a position is generally a stepping-stone to the cardinalate; but Lacordaire, far from manifesting any gratitude for M. Boyer's consideration, has-

[1] *Mémoires d' Outre-Tombe*, vol. ii.

tened to interject: "Had I coveted honors, I would have remained in the world; therefore think no more of this project. I shall remain a simple priest, and probably I shall yet become a religious." It is evident that Lacordaire felt, with Pascal, that "the mania for being somebody destroys the best minds of our day. Glory is the greatest thing here below; and that very fact shows how little the things of earth really are."

Lacordaire began his priestly life at Paris just as he finished it at Sorèze; teaching the young, whose sympathies he knew so well how to captivate, at first as almoner in the College of Henry IV., and then in the same capacity with the Sisters of the Visitation. He devoted his spare time to the study of Christian apologetics, and to the gathering of those materials from the Bible, patrology, history, and philosophy, which afterward he used so advantageously in the pulpit. But he seems to have yearned for a more active life. We read that he often asked himself: "What am I doing? I dream, I read, I pray to the good God, I laugh two or three times a week, and I weep once or twice. Sometimes I rage against the University, that most unendurable child of kings that I know." He thought of becoming a missionary in the United States; and, having received permission from Mgr. de Quélen, he accepted the Vicar-Generalship of New York from Mgr. Dubois, who was then in Paris. However, it had been decreed by Providence that he should remain in his beloved France. He had already begun to bid farewell to his friends when he received from Abbé Gerbet a letter tendering him an associate editorship on the "Avenir," then just founded by Lamennais. The motto of this new journal, "God and Liberty," banished from his mind every yearning for a foreign mission. Lamennais, Gerbet and Montalembert had taken seriously the cry of "Liberty," with which the usurping "king of the *bourgeoisie*," Louis-Philippe, had saluted the forced flight of the lawful heir of St. Louis. They thought they saw some hope in that insult to the fallen monarch, "At last the Constitution will be a reality." They fancied that the "days of July" meant a possibility of a successful assault on the thraldom of the University; in fine, they believed that freedom of education, for which the Catholics of France had prayed so long, was now attainable.[1]

[1] One of the most judicious publicists of this century, the erudite Benedictine, Dom Piolin, thus speaks of the French University, which was fondly supposed to have taken the place of the grand University of Paris. *Mutatis mutandis*, all that he says may be applied to the University as it subsists under the present Third Republic:

"Certainly the French University is an evil; it is founded on a principle which is false and contrary to Christianity. It is also the most active instrument of tyranny. The decree of March 17, 1808, by which Napoleon I. instituted it, was one of the

From this time, during several years the life of Lacordaire was intertwined with that of Lamennais. Before we sketch the career of this extraordinary man—a career which was so agitated, sombre and well-nigh tragic—a few words should be said concerning the sources which are available to one who wishes to form an approximately accurate conception of him. Of course, a good idea of the man may be attained by the excellent biographical studies which we possess in regard to those grand characters with whose careers that of Lamennais was connected during its most notable phases—the "Lives" of Lacordaire,[1] Montalembert,[2] Gerbet[3] and Maurice de Guerin.[4] But although forty-three years have passed since the *corbillard des pauvres* conveyed the mortal frame of Lamennais to Père-la-Chaise, the illustrious unfortunate has not been the subject of a really satisfactory biographer; of one, that is, who has been able to discover and unite the details of his striking career. Ange Blaize, one of his nephews, published in 1858 a "Biographical Essay," which gave many precious documents, but which was merely a sketch of his uncle's life. In 1859 M. Forgues, to whom Lamennais had bequeathed his papers, published two volumes of interesting correspondence, but they cover only the years 1818–1840, as the relatives of Lamennais secured a decree from the Court of Appeals, in Paris, prohibiting Forgues from issuing any more of the letters.[5] In 1866 Ange

greatest crimes of the despot—one of those by which he most efficaciously dishonored our unfortunate country. . . . . Talleyrand, another evil genius of France, had divined that a body constituted outside the Church, giving instruction to the youth of an entire nation, would produce a race similar, if not inferior, to the ancient pagans. The views of these two men have been realized; at the present hour they are being realized more and more; wait a little, and you will see their bitter fruits. If the Christian spirit, which is still strongly implanted in the hearts of the majority of the French people, did not succeed in rejecting the virus insinuated into the young children of both sexes, we should have to despair of the country; to expect, every ten or twelve years, the orgies of the Commune; and to behold the worst savagery, the normal condition of a nation without God, without worship, and without morality. How comes it, then, that many eminent men, many honorable characters, even many truly pious and learned priests, join a corporation whose consequences are so dangerous? To this question there are many answers. . . . . In the new University many of the old teaching corporations had some of their members; and these maintained an excellent spirit, impelling many to regard the institution as a continuation, or even a renovation, of the venerable University of Paris, with which it had nothing in common."

[1] *Le Révérend Père, H. D., Lacordaire*, par le R. P. Chocarne, 2 vols. in 12mo; *Le Père Lacordaire*, par le Comte de Montalembert, 1 vol. in 12 mo.; "Le Père Lacordaire," par J. Guillermin, in the *Illustrations du XIXe Siècle.*

[2] *Charles de Montalembert*, par H. Fournier, 1 vol. in 8vo.

[3] *Monseigneur Gerbet, Sa Vie, Ses Œuvres, et l'Ecole Menaisienne*, par l'Abbé de Ladoue, 3 vols. in 8vo.

[4] "Eugenie et Maurice de Guérin," par Camille d'Arvor, in the *Illustrations.*

[5] *Œuvres Posthumes de F. Lamennais.* Publiées selon le Vœu de l'Auteur, par E. D. Forgues.

Blaize produced two volumes of unedited works, which embraced only those of the author's early life.[1] In the same year Eugene de la Gournerie, of all men one of the best versed in the religious matters of our century, edited the letters which the two Lamennais brothers had written to Gabriel Bruté, at first professor in the seminary of Rennes, then a priest on the American mission, and finally bishop of Vincennes, in Indiana.[2]

On the death of Mgr. Bruté, in 1839, these letters had passed into the hands of Bishop Dubois, of New York, and in time Archbishop Hughes gave them to Henri de Courcy, an American correspondent of the Paris "Univers." The packet bore the following endorsement by Bruté, which must interest American readers: "Seventy letters from the two brothers, Jean and Féli de Lamennais. Exceedingly interesting, as treating of the ecclesiastical, literary and political affairs of that time. I must preserve this treasure, even after it has ceased to be one of friendship. Oh, my God! Accept this separation! How I feel it, even now that twelve years have passed!" In these letters of Féli, says La Gournerie, we hear "the ardent voice of Tertullian, and the sweeter accents of St. Francis de Sales."

Another excellent source of knowledge in regard to Lamennais is the already cited work on Gerbet by the Abbé de Ladoue (1872). "The life of Gerbet," says Sainte-Beuve, "is very simple, having but one episode—his relationship with Lamennais, to whom he gave himself, for many years, with an unlimited devotion, and which terminated only when the grand, immoderate spirit rebelled. Gerbet, after having fulfilled the duties of a religious friendship, after waiting and hoping, retired in silence. For a long time he had been to Lamennais what Nicole was to Arnauld—a moderator. He had softened his friend's asperities as much as possible, and had saved him from many collisions. Only when there remained no possibility of continuing the task did he grow weary."[3]

Another precious source of information is one by Arthur du Bois de la Villerabel,[4] embracing one hundred and fifty-two letters, addressed to Louis Marion, one of the friends of Lamennais from his boyhood; and in this correspondence the writer probably reveals his soul as in none of his other letters.

Probably the most valuable source of information is that published in 1893 by the oratorian, Alfred Roussel,[5] a collection of

[1] *Œuvres Inédites de F. de Lamennais.* Publiées par M. A. Blaize.

[2] *Lettres Inédites de J. M. et de F. de Lamennais, Addressées à Mgr. Bruté,* avec une Introduction, par Eugène de la Gournerie.

[3] *Causeries du Lundi,* vol. vi. p. 314.

[4] *Confidences de Lamennais,* 1896.

[5] *Lamennais, d'après des Documents Inédits,* par Alfred Roussel de l'Oratoire de Rennes, 2 vols., in 16mo., avec portrait.

letters written by the two Lamennais and by the principal frequenters of La Chênaie, which were furnished to Roussel by another oratorian, Mathurin Houet, whose life had been for many years bound up with that of the great writer, and who never despaired of the wanderer's ultimate conversion, as we shall see. The volume issued in 1895 by Eugene Spuller, a politician of some note in the councils of the present Third Republic, affects the profundity of a philosophical essay, but it furnishes nothing new concerning its subject.

In 1896 there appeared a work in English[1] which might have benefited those who cannot recur to the admirable writings of Roussel and Ricard, had the author confined himself to the cold facts which those judicious publicists had marked out for him, and had he not essayed reflections on philosophical and theological matters which are evidently beyond his ken. The title of this book is at least misleading. None of the enthusiasts of La Chênaie would have associated their names with that malodorous and nondescript thing which has been styled "Liberal Catholicism." Perhaps the term "Catholic Liberals" may be properly applied to Lacordaire, Montalembert, Gerbet, Guerin and a few others of that interesting company, inasmuch as they aimed at a Catholicizing of the modicum of good which was discernible in the political liberalism which was the will-o'-the-wisp of their day. But "Liberal Catholics" they were not; and Lamennais himself, even when involved in rebellion to the Chair of Peter, would have spurned the name. And even though "the master" would have accepted the designation, even though his revolt may be regarded as the end toward which the "Liberal Catholic" must tend, one man does not constitute a "movement." Mr. Gibson gives us to understand, on two or three occasions, that he is a Catholic; but he has produced a book which will lead the unwary to think that the catastrophe of the life of Lamennais was the result of the influence of a besottedly obstinate royalist cabal upon papal pig-headedness.

Born at Saint-Malo in 1781, Felicité-Robert de Lamennais prosecuted his early studies amid the storms of the great revolution. Such surroundings quite naturally caused the teachings of Rousseau to be more attractive to his juvenile mind than those of Christ. But in his twenty-second year he abandoned the paths of incredulism, made his first communion, and received the ecclesiastical tonsure. Not until he had attained his thirty-seventh year, and therefore the maturity of his powers, did he receive the priest-

[1] *The Abbé de Lamennais and the Liberal Catholic Movement in France*, by the Hon. W. Gibson, 1 vol., 8vo.

hood. Several years before he ascended the altar, he had announced his change of front by the publication of a translation of the "Spiritual Guide" of Louis of Blois; but attention to him as a serious thinker had not been accorded until 1808, when he issued his "Reflections on the Condition of the Church During the Eighteenth Century and on the Present Situation," attacking the "Organic Articles" which Napoleon had audaciously added to the already signed Concordat of 1801. Of course these reflections were interdicted by Fouché, the imperial Minister of Police. In 1814 Lamennais published a treatise on "The Tradition of the Church Concerning the Institution of Bishops," a work which procured for him much contradiction on the part of dying Gallicanism. In 1818 appeared the first volume of his "Essay on Indifference in Religious Matters," the key-note of which was struck by the ardent Breton at its very commencement: "Ah! who will breathe on these dry bones and give life to them? Good and evil; the tree which gives life, and that which entails death, both nourished by one and the same soil, grow among peoples who, scarcely raising their heads, pass beneath, stretch upwards their hands, and pluck the fruit by chance." The somewhat bilious and ironic style of the book aided the incontestable arguments which it presented; a happy reaction was soon evident in a society which had been permeated by the poison of Voltairianism and of the Revolution. The author was regarded by many as another Father of the Church. As Lacordaire said: "A hundred and fourteen years had passed over the tomb of Bossuet, a hundred and three over that of Fénelon, seventy-six over that of Massillon . . . . when M. de Lamennais appeared. . . . In one day he found himself invested with the power of Bossuet." Jean-Marie, the holy brother of the brilliant publicist, who had toiled patiently to develop in him both intellectuality and piety, felt that his labor was now bearing promise of ultimate reward, and in his exultation he cried: "God has made him a soldier." Even he who had hitherto ranked, in the estimation of the French clergy, as the first of their champions of that day—even Fraysinous declared: "That man has an eloquence which would raise the dead." Joseph Le Maistre pronounced the effect of the essay to be nothing less than "an earthquake under a leaden sky," and Montalembert saw in its author "the most celebrated and the most venerated of the French priests." Naturally there were some ultra conservatives who murmured their displeasure because of some very daring flights of the new apologist, but the majority agreed with De Bonald when he told Lamennais: "Let the frogs croak!"[1]

[1] "Lamennais upheld the papal authority with democratic ardor, recalling all the

The first volume of the essay had shown the importance and necessity of faith; but there remained many questions for solution. What is the true faith? How can we discover it? What authority should dominate and regulate human reason? Great was the impatience with which men awaited the second volume, in which they were confident that if Lamennais did not succeed in advancing any *nova*, he would at least present matters *nove*. "After two years of expectation," writes Lacordaire, "the second volume appeared. From the heights of the the olden defence of the faith, from the bosom of the eloquence which he had sent in waves against the enemies of truth, M. de Lamennais had descended into the arid discussions of philosophy—to the question of certitude, at once the clearest and the most obscure approached by the human mind." In fact, Lamennais had undertaken to prove that "man, taken individually, can know nothing with certainty:

arguments which were ever adduced against certainty, and concluding that, in the order of principles, certitude is impossible, if there does not exist any infallible authority; and concluding also that, in the order of facts, such an authority always existed. That authority is the Catholic Church, in the triple manifestation of the divine word in patriarchal tradition, Moses and Christ. In the *Essay on Indifference*, wonderful for its close reasoning and its robust eloquence, Lamennais concedes to philosophers that the adhesion of the intellect is distinctive of truth, but only when that adhesion is characterized by universality and perpetuity—qualities which are found only in the Catholic Church, and which are in her because she is the traditional echo of the divine word in every place and time. Descending to applications (in his *Religion Considered in its Relation to the Political and Civil Orders*, Paris, 1825), he combats the irreligious tendencies of politics. In the Middle Age the Catholic Church imposed belief and duties, and out of a dismembered society she formed one which was divine and indestructible, tending to reduce all to unity, and to co-ordinate the nations as members of one sole family. When the belief of the Middle Age had been shaken, 'political science became one of force directed by interest; between the peoples there was no right, but that of blind and brutal strength; between power and its subjects, the same blind and brutal strength.' Three systems dominate in Europe (continues Lamennais): the Catholic, which places the spiritual power of the Church between the sovereign and the subject; the Gallican, which makes kings irremovable, frees them from every really obligatory law and leaves tyranny as the sole remedy against tyranny; and finally, the philosophical system, which constitutes the people the judge in every question of sovereignty. Therefore, Lamennais called for freedom of the press, of association, of teaching; and he placed the sovereignty in the people, declaring the king liable to deposition if he violated the law. The purblind liberals could not understand these theories, and they hooted at this priest who would have pushed the world back to the feet of Gregory VII.; but the king understood it, and its defender was called before the correctional tribunals. Many of the bishops, frightened at the resoluteness of Lamennais, emitted, in Paris, an exposition of their sentiments in regard to the independence of kings in the temporal order, as upheld by the Declaration of 1682. Lamennais, in a mordant reply, ridiculed both liberals and Gallicans, who by their withdrawal of the civil power from all religious dependence, rendered it capable of degenerating into tyranny; he pitied the clergy who were courtiers of a government which protected them merely that it might have their support; and he insisted that from those brutal governments which robbed the prelates of their purple and jewels, those prelates derived that real glory of martyrdom which sanctifies the earth." Cantù, *Storia Universale*, bk. xviii., ch. 18.

but taken collectively, he can acquire certainty as to some things." In other words, one man may err; but when all agree, truth is found. Lacordaire ingenuously tells us: "I have often asked myself how a system, the faultiness of which I now perceive so clearly, could have held my reason in suspense for so long a time; and I have come to the conclusion that since I struggled against an intelligence stronger than my own, and struggled alone against it, it was impossible for me not to be conquered." If a mind like that of Lacordaire succumbed to the influence of Lamennais, it is not surprising that the brilliant apologist became the idol of nearly all the younger clergy of France, and that from every portion of Europe the dangerous incense of extravagant praise was wafted toward him. No wonder that he became "that grand immoderate spirit" which Sainte-Beuve described; and that to those who suspected his philosophy, especially to the bishops of France, he retorted either that they were all Gallicans, or that they understood nothing about the matter in question. No physical advantages on his part contributed to the ascendency which this wonderful genius exercised over so many persons of more than ordinarily judicial perspicacity. Maurice de Guérin, shortly after his enrollment among the solitaries of La Chénaie, thus wrote to his sister Eugénie: "You see a Druid resuscitated in Brittany, chanting of liberty with a rather savage voice. . . . . The great man is short, slim, pallid, gray-eyed, with an oblong head, the nose long and thick, and his forehead is furrowed deeply by wrinkles which stretch between the brows down to the root of the nose. From head to foot he is clothed in coarse gray cloth, and he wears a straw hat which is very dilapidated." And Wiseman says of him: "How he did so mightily prevail on others it is hard to say. He was truly in look and presence almost contemptible; small, weakly, without pride of countenance or mastery of eye, without any external grace; his tongue seemed to be the organ by which, unaided, he gave marvellous utterance to thoughts clear, deep, and strong. Several times have I held long conversations with him at various intervals, and he was always the same. With his head hung down, his hands clasped before him, or gently moving in one another, in answer to a question he poured out a stream of thought, flowing spontaneously and unrippled as a stream through a summer meadow. He at once seized the whole subject, divided it into heads as symmetrically as Fléchier or Massillon; then took them one by one, enucleated each, and drew his conclusions. All this went on in a monotonous but soft tone, and so unbroken, so unhesitating, and yet so polished and elegant, that, if you had closed your eyes, you might have easily fancied that you were listening to the reading of a finished and elaborately corrected volume."

The "Avenir" appeared for the first time on October 15, 1830; and the government of July was soon made to understand that no ordinary men were insisting that the State should respect "those who bore the grand name of Catholics." Prosecution followed after prosecution; and when on one of these occasions the daring editors were charged with being the "organs of a foreign power," Lacordaire replied that their Master, God, is nowhere a foreigner. The "Avenir" announced that on May 9, 1831, its editors would open a free school in a house hired by Lacordaire; and accordingly three teachers who had not been authorized by the State, namely, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and De Coux, began their labors with twenty scholars. On the second day a commissary of police ordered the pupils, in the name of the law, to depart. "In the name of your parents," cried Lacordaire, "I command you to remain;" and the children obeyed him. Then the police ejected both pupils and master, although the latter was in his own house. As one of the teachers, Montalembert, was a peer of France, the trial of the fearful criminals was conducted by the Court of Peers. The brilliant defence of Lacordaire, and the equally impressive one of young Montalembert, are matters of history; a minimum of punishment, a fine of a hundred francs, was inflicted. A more threatening storm, however, was soon encountered by the daring journal. Shortly after the appearance of the first number of the "Avenir," its editors had formed an association entitled a "General Agency for the Defence of Religious Liberty," which was destined to propagate the doctrines which the journal would advance. These doctrines were all in advocacy of a total separation of Church and State; of a suppression of the indemnities which the French government had agreed to give the Church, in partial recompense (about a quarter of 1 per cent.) for the ecclesiastical property stolen by it in the days of Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality; of entire freedom of worship for all imaginable sects; of freedom of instruction; and of absolute liberty of the press. To this mixture of good and evil the "Avenir" frequently advanced pretensions of a more audacious and radical nature. Thus, in the issue of February 2, 1831, we read: "During the last fifteen years M. de Lamennais has labored for the regeneration of Catholicism; to restore to it, under a new form and by the aid of recent progress, the force and the life which have abandoned it." In many of the dioceses of France the ordinaries prohibited the adventurous periodical; and many, notably Mgr. d'Astros, Archbishop of Toulouse, condemned fifty-six propositions of the Lamennaisian system. The first twenty of these propositions were taken from the "Essay on Indifference" (Vols. 3 and 4); eleven were drawn from the "Philosophical Doctrines on Certitude," by the Abbé Olympe-Philippe Gerbet, afterward Bishop of Perpignan; eight from the

"Catechism of the Sensus Communis," by Rohrbacher; and seventeen from the "Avenir" itself. In 1834 thirteen bishops formally censured these propositions; and shortly afterward thirty-seven other prelates sent in their adhesion to the condemnation, while fourteen, though not adhering, manifested their disapproval of Lamennaisism. Ten bishops preferred to refer the matter at once to the Holy See.[1] This condemnation was forwarded to Rome in 1832; but already Lamennais, Lacordaire and Montalembert, the three principal editors, had decided to suspend the publication of the "Avenir" temporarily, and to proceed to the Eternal City as "pilgrims of God and liberty," with the intention of submitting their doctrines to the judgment of the Vicar of Christ.

It is amusing to note that Mr. Gibson, who thinks that the episcopal condemnation of the "Avenir" may have been short-sighted, is careful to inform us that, "*amongst Catholics the condemnation was re-echoed by the worldly-wise*, the interested, and the timidly devout—all those, that is to say, the slothful serenity of whose devotional or social atmosphere had been disturbed by the somewhat acrid terms of the uncompromising journal, and who seized the opportunity which now offered itself of turning over and composing themselves to sleep through that great drama of human society, the action of which was beginning too vividly to impress them." In the minds of such Catholics as these, religion, according to Mr. Gibson, "had been identified with the divine right of kings;" and we are frequently asked by this author to sympathize with Lamennais as he suffers from "their cowardly and underhand operations." The unfortunate writes to a friend at this time that these "interdicts, intrigues, underhand dealings—a frightful system of organized calumny—have been supported by Rome. Without explaining herself, ... without wishing to pronounce a judgment we asked for humbly six months ago, she encourages and even urges on her enemies and ours. The position is untenable; we are going to abandon the 'Avenir,' which was working splendidly. The only barrier which stood between the Church and material force is about to fall; . . . . my soul is torn with grief. They repel, they trample on those who ask only one thing, that they should be allowed to sacrifice themselves, and the triumph of the Church would have been certain had they only wished it. . . . . But no, her rulers have said it, it is necessary that she should die, it is necessary . . . . ." It was with these sentiments rankling in his heart that Lamennais set out for Rome.

---

[1] *Défense de l'Ordre Social Contre le Carbonarisme Moderne; avec un Jugement sur M. de Lamennais*, par M. Boyer, Directeur au Seminaire de Saint-Sulpice. Paris, 1835.

We would prefer to remain under the guidance of Chocarne or of Ricard; but the persistent efforts of Mr. Gibson to palliate the guilt of his idol demand that we at least show how he prepares one for the action of Gregory XVI., "the monk inexperienced in the things of this world." He informs us that after Napoleon's "war of liberation" during that period, which "demonstrated the utility of an organization like that of the Carbonari," it is "abundantly evident, from contemporary literature, that the Popes might at this time have succeeded in winning for themselves a great position, as the representatives of a great idea; but, unfortunately, no one capable of realizing this was elected to the See of Peter. . . . . Leo XII. was mediæval in his sympathies. By nature he was by no means despotic; but his reign became the occasion of a fatal reaction, sometimes marked with frightful atrocities. . . . . Thus it happened that the name of one of the best intentioned of Popes came to be identified in the eyes of the Italians with the revival of inquisitorial methods, the encouragement of informers, secret trials before interested tribunals, and all the abominations of which men had fondly imagined that they had finally disappeared." Since such is Mr. Gibson's reading of history, we may suppose that he sympathizes with Lamennais (and not once in his book does he give us any reason to suppose the contrary) when the jaundiced visitor writes to Gerbet while he is waiting for an audience with Gregory XVI.: "Imagine to yourself an old man surrounded by men, many of them tonsured, who manage his affairs —men to whom religion is as indifferent as it is to all the cabinets of Europe—ambitious, covetous, avaricious . . . . blind and infatuated as the eunuchs of the Lower Empire. Such is the government of this country, such are the men who have everything in their hands, and who daily sacrifice the Church to the vilest interests and the most vainly conceived of their temporal affairs. They count the peoples for nothing, and see in the world only ten or a dozen men who have become, because they are powerful, or seem so, their true divinities. And in spite of this, everything is sinking or passing away, everything is dying. There are a few virtuous people who see this and who groan at it; but the remedy —where is it? I cannot see it."

A memorial, drawn up by Lacordaire, was presented to Gregory XVI. Unable to approve the tendencies of the incriminated journal, the Pontiff willingly recognized the zeal and talent of its editors; therefore, he ordered information to be given to them of an early examination of their doctrines, and he added that since this examination might necessitate a tedious investigation, a return to France would probably be pleasing to them. But the impetuous Lamennais besieged the doors of Cardinal Pacca, and finally

a pontifical audience was granted on condition that there should be no allusion to the "Avenir." "Hoping against hope," says Gibson, that the audience "might result in winning for the Church a place in that future which seemed to him inevitable" (truly the Church should be grateful for his consideration), Lamennais proceeded to the Vatican. Ricard tells us that when Lamennais prostrated himself before the Pontiff his Holiness gently raised him, and opening his own snuff-box asked him whether he ever used the stimulant. Politeness led the Abbé to take a pinch, and the Pope, having also taken one, and having scrupulously flickered off some fallen grains from his soutane, asked his visitor whether he was fond of art. "Sometimes, Holy Father," replied the impatient man. "That is not enough," returned the Pontiff. Then with something very like impertinence Lamennais explained: "I love art in its proper place, Your Holiness, but at present . . . ." Whereupon Gregory hastened to remark: "Nevertheless, in Rome art is a very important matter." Persisting in his endeavor to introduce the affair of the "Avenir," the Abbé observed: "Undoubtedly, Holy Father; but if Your Holiness will permit me . . . ." Again the Pontiff warded off the inconvenient subject by asking: "Monsieur l'Abbé, have you visited the church of St. Peter in Chains?" The question seemed to furnish a fine opportunity, and Lamennais replied: "I have visited it, Holy Father; and would to God no other church in Christendom were 'in chains!'" The Pope ignored the allusion, and pursued his train of thought: "Did you admire the 'Moses' of Michelangelo?" And Gregory went to a bureau, and producing a silver statuette, he asked: "Do you recognize the lion's paw?" Lamennais looked at the precious object, but with an air of distraction. The Pope insisted: "Look at it well!" The poor man obeyed, and the Pontiff said: "I would like to give it to you; but nothing here belongs to me, since I must transmit, in my turn, all I have received to my successor." Then Gregory tenderly placed his hand on the head of his disappointed visitor, and having blessed him, said: "Farewell, Monsieur l'Abbé." The self love of Lamennais was deeply wounded by this interview. He failed, and all of his apologists have failed, to perceive the delicacy of the Pontiff's hesitation to enter on a subject, the consideration of which might entail the condemnation of one whom his predecessor had so admired, that he kept his portrait in his study, and bequeathed it to his successor.[1]

"The master," as Lamennais was styled by his admirers, wished

[1] Many have thought that Leo XII. intended, at one time, to enroll Lamennais in the Sacred College. See Wiseman's *Last Four Popes*, pt. ii., ch. 6.

to remain in Rome and provoke a decision, but Lacordaire had appreciated the meaning of the late audience, and he returned to France. Six months afterward, Lamennais lost his patience, and announced his intention to return also, and for the purpose of resuming the publication of the "Avenir." The sojourn in the capital of Christendom had evoked very dissimilar sentiments in the hearts of these two great men. The mind of Lamennais was of far superior calibre to that of Luther, and he possessed an artistic taste, of which the German heresiarch had no conception. But the pride of Lamennais was as excessive as the vanity of the ex-Augustinian; and having entered Rome while dominated by that passion, he, like Luthur during his visit, could discern nothing but ambition, subterfuge and luxury. On the contrary, Lacordaire, like his other companion, Montalembert, though burning with perhaps even a more intense love of liberty than that which tortured Lamennais, returned from Rome strengthened in his faith that she was the depository of divine revelation. "The world seeks peace and freedom, but in the paths of turbulence and servitude. The Church alone has ever been a source of these blessings for the human race. When the nations shall have tired of being parricides, they will find in her the good which they no longer possess. . . . . Rome! Serene amid the tempests of Europe, thou hast not doubted of thyself, thou hast felt no fatigue. Thy glance, turned to the four quarters of the world, followed with sublime penetration the development of human affairs in their relation to the divine; while the storms left thee calm, because thou wast animated by the breath of God. . . . . Rome! God knows that I did not fail to recognize thee, when I saw no kings prostrate at thy gates. I kissed thy dust with unspeakable joy and respect. Thou didst appear to me as what thou truly art—the benefactress of the human family in the past, the hope of its future, the sole grandeur now existing in Europe, the captive of a universal jealousy, the queen of the world."

In August, 1832, Lacordaire visited Munich, and he had scarcely entered his hotel when he was met by Lamennais and Montalembert, who, on their way to France, had seen a notice of their friend's intention. Lacordaire at once entered on the subject of the resumption of the "Avenir," and he succeeded in convincing "the master" of its inadvisability. Then the three friends attended a banquet tendered to them by the scholars and artists of the most literary and artistic city in Germany. Toward the end of the feast, Lamennais was called from the hall to receive from a messenger of the papal nuncio a copy of the Encyclical of Gregory XVI., in which the "Avenir" was condemned. Lamennais dissimulated his rage, and he even yielded to Lacordaire's suggestion that the

three ex-editors should immediately sign an act of submission to the Papal decision. Accompanying the copy of the Encyclical received by Lamennais was a letter from Cardinal Pacca, which, by the express order of Pope Gregory XVI., that prelate had written to him. We subjoin a few passages of this interesting document:

"Since you love truth, and desire to know it in order that you may welcome it, I shall frankly and briefly mention the chief features which have specially displeased His Holiness, after his examination of the "Avenir." Firstly, he regretted that the editors have assumed to discuss before the public, and then even to decide, most delicate questions which should be decided by the government of the Church and by her supreme head. From this procedure there necessarily results a perturbation of minds, and even a division among the clergy, which scandalizes the faithful. Secondly, the Holy Father disapproves and even reprobates those doctrines on civil and political liberty which, undoubtedly against your wishes, tend by their very nature to incite and propagate everywhere among subjects a spirit of rebellion against their sovereigns. That spirit is openly opposed to the precepts of the Gospel and of our holy Church—obedience on the part of the peoples, and justice on the part of rulers. Thirdly, the doctrines of the "Avenir" on freedom of worship and on the liberty of the press—doctrines which have been advanced by the editors with so much exaggeration—are reprehensible, being contrary to the maxims and precepts of the Church. They have surprised and afflicted His Holiness; because if, in certain circumstances, prudence commends a toleration of them as a lesser evil, they can never be defended by a Catholic as good and desirable things. This, M. l'Abbé, is the communication His Holiness has wished me to convey to you in confidential form. The Holy Father remembers with keen satisfaction the beautiful and solemn promise which you, at the head of your associate editors, once published, to the effect that you would imitate, according to the injunctions of our Saviour, the docility of little children, by an entire submission to the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

Lacordaire soon realized that a gulf was between him and Lamennais, and on September 4, 1832, he wrote to "the master:" "To-night I leave La Chênaie,[1] and I do this from a motive of

[1] La Chênaie was a venerable country house in Brittany, about six miles from Dinan, whither M. Féli, as his friends fondly termed Lamennais, was wont to assemble his disciples during the last years of the Restoration and during the first years of the king of the *bourgeoisie*. The Lamennaisians playfully styled the humble habitation a *chateau*, but Féli describes it as a little hermitage. Between the years 1825 and 1833 many of the friends of "the master" resided altogether at La Chênaie, enjoying the tender hospitality of him whom they regarded as one chosen by God to form their minds for the defence of religion—the sole object of their lives. Among

honor, being convinced that at length my life is useless to you, because of the difference of our ideas on the Church and society, a difference which increases every day, in spite of my sincere efforts to agree with you." And he afterward said: "I abandoned M. de Lamennais because I believed that the Church was more likely to be right than he was, because she has more claim to the submission of my intellect than he has. I have not instituted a school in place of his, but I have entered into the universal school." His reasons for separating from his old-time friend are indicated by Lacordaire in a letter to Montalembert: "The Church does not say to you, 'See!' for she has not that power; but she does say to you, 'Believe!' She says to you, now that you are twenty-three years old, and addicted to a certain line of thought, just what she said to you on the day of your First Communion: 'Receive the hidden and incomprehensible God; humble your reason before that of God and His Church, His organ.' Why, indeed, was the Church given to us, unless to lead us back to truth when we have been beguiled by error?"

In January, 1835, Lacordaire was appointed teacher of the Lenten Conferences at Notre Dame, and then Paris beheld what was to her a strange scene—the great basilica invaded at an early hour by more than six thousand men of every age, religion and political school, all waiting to be refreshed by the all-powerful words of him of whom Montalembert wrote: "Who will render

---

those who nearly habitually resided at La Chênaie was Gerbet, and among those who passed much of their time there we may mention, besides Lacordaire, Edmond de Corzalès, Leon and Eugene Boré, M. de Coux, the Abbé Rohrbacher, the Abbé Blanc, the Abbé Bornet, M. de Hercé, Montalembert, the Abbé de Salinis, the Abbé de Scorbiac, Eloi Jourdain (Charles Sainte-Foy), Cyprien Robert, La Provotaye, Daniel du Breil de Marzan, Hippolyte de la Morvonnais and Maurice de Guérin. The last named tells us, in his *Relics*: "Unless one experienced it, the charm of these conversations could not be described. There philosophy, politics, travels, anecdotes, tales, pleasantries, all dropped from the lips of the master in forms the most original, the most vivid, the most incisive." Every morning Féli assembled his friends in the chapel, which, in 1810, his holy brother and he had built at the extremity of the terrace, and there he celebrated Mass, and frequently fortified them with the Bread of Life. Many times during the day the company visited their Sacramental Lord, and on all feasts of celebrity they received the Benediction. Many years after he had quitted La Chênaie, and the most melancholy of dissensions had separated him from his olden friends, Lamennais wrote to M. Marion, who had advised the sale of some of the timber: "Although apparently I shall never again see La Chênaie, all my souvenirs reside there, and I cannot think, without pain, of that beautiful spot, so cared for by me, as shorn of any of its charms. In comparison with those charms, what is a little money? Even now I walk in imagination under those trees in whose sap my olden life ran. It seems to me that if they were gone, I would be alone in the world. I know well that others will cut them down some day, but then I shall be no longer alive. Therefore, I ask a respite for those poor trees; their age is too much like my own, and I cannot see death approaching those who looked on my birth." Letter to M. Marion, December 31, 1844, in the *Confidences de Lamennais.*

for us his surprises, his risky strokes, his familiarities—those adventurous assaults of a genius as audacious, as sure of itself, skirting the precipice without ever falling over, and then mounting to the highest heavens as Bossuet alone has ever done; an effort which literally overwhelmed his auditors, leaving them a prey to an emotion which only one word can express, that word *ravissement*, which has been so commonly abused, but which recalls to the Christian mind the vision of St. Paul—*quoniam raptus in paradisum.*"

The grand conferences of Lacordaire are probably familiar to the reader; if they are not, let him know that all of the great orator's teachings, inasmuch as they affected the hitherto unbelieving portion of his hearers, may be summarized in his words: "The olden society perished, because God had been expelled from it; the new suffers, because God has not been invited into it." The limits of this article preclude any reference to his career as a Dominican friar, or to his momentous reception into the French Academy, which he entered, as he expressed the idea, as "a symbol of liberty, strengthened by religion." He adorned the Academy only for a moment. When he returned to his dear College of Sorèze, he greeted his brethren and pupils with these prophetic words: "I come to you like Œdipus, with a fragile laurel in one hand, and a bit of cypress in the other." He resumed his work, but his God had called him to his reward. During his last illness he composed that canticle on St. Mary Magdalen, which many regard as his masterpiece. On September 27, 1861, he resigned his office as provincial of the French Dominicans, and the last words of his eloquent tongue were uttered on November 20th, as he extended his arms toward heaven: "*Mon Dieu! Ouvrez-moi!*" He died on the following day, the Feast of the Presentation.[1]

Sadly different from the death of Lacordaire was that of him whom God seemed, at one time, to have given to His Church as

[1] If the reader would know something as to the personal appearance of Lacordaire, he may learn from Montalembert what the great orator was when he had just enlisted under the banner of Lamennais:

"He was twenty-eight years of age. His slender frame, his delicate and regular features, his sculptural brow, the royal carriage of his head, his black and flashing eye, and I know not what union of elegance and modesty in his entire person—all this was but the envelope of a soul which ever seemed to be on the point of flying away to heaven. His flaming glances emitted treasures both of indignation and of tenderness. His voice, already so nervous and vibrating, often assumed an accent of infinite sweetness. Born for combat and for love, he already bore the seal of the double royalty of soul and of talent. He appeared to me charming at once and terrible; the very type of enthusiasm for good, and of virtue armed in the cause of truth. I saw in him one predestined to all that youth adores and desires the most—to genius and glory."

the Bossuet of the nineteenth century. When the future ornament of the Dominican Order and his friend returned to La Chênaie, after their futile visit to the Eternal City, the former soon perceived that there was to be no revival of the serene delights which had made the "little hermitage" so dear to each of them. "The woods," writes Lacordaire, "had their olden silences and their olden storms; the sky of Brittany was the same, but the heart of the master was changed. The wound was still fresh, and each day the knife was turned in it by the very hand which should have withdrawn it and poured into its place the balm of God. Profound gloom had settled on that brow from which peace had been banished. Broken and menacing sentences dropped from those lips which had ever expressed the unction of the Gospel. Sometimes I thought that in him I beheld Saul, but none of us had the harp of David with which to calm those sudden irruptions of the evil one, and most fearful anticipations constantly overwhelmed my crushed spirit." The crisis could not be long delayed. In 1834 appeared the "Paroles d'un Croyant," a work which Lamennais himself pronounced a revenge for all the "disappointments of his life." Once that he had resolved on the publication of this book, which Gregory XVI. was to term "small in size but immense in perversity," he yearned to see it in circulation. He entrusted the task of putting the manuscript through the press to Sainte-Beuve, writing to him: "I send you herewith a little manuscript which I would wish you to have issued as quickly as possible. I depart in two days. Arrange with a publisher quickly, very quickly, I pray you." It has been well said that the contents of this work can be summarized in two propositions: all kings are monsters, and priests are the *seides* of kings. And over this blatant demagogy the author affected to make the sign of the cross, beginning it with the invocation: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Royer-Collard fancies that he sees in the book the spirit of 1793 making its Easter duty. De Nettement calls it a would-be Apocalypse, interspersed with blasphemies. Vitrolles termed it the red cap of the *sans-culottes* surmounting the cross. These qualifications do not exaggerate, for the calmly judicial Encyclical of June 25, 1834, manifests the horror of the Supreme Pontiff for a volume which, as we have observed, he stigmatizes as *mole quidem exiguum, pravitate tamen ingentem,* and he declares that it presents propositions which are respectively "false, calumnious, rash, productive of anarchy, contrary to the word of God, impious, scandalous, erroneous, already condemned by the Holy Church when anathematizing the Waldenses, Wyckliffites, Hussites and other heretics of that stamp." We may also note that this Encyclical also condemns a system of

philosophy which is evidently that of Lamennais. "You must perceive, Venerable Brothers, that here we also speak of that fallacious system of philosophy, recently invented, which we must reprobate entirely—a system in which an uncurbed yearning for novelties seeks no longer for truth where she really is to be found, but rather, casting aside holy and apostolic tradition, introduces doctrines which are futile, uncertain, and not at all approved by the Church." Lamennais celebrated the Holy Sacrifice for the last time on April 7th, the Easter Sunday of 1833. "Who would have said on that day," asks Sainte-Beuve, "who would have said to those who were grouped around the master, that he who had just given to them the Holy Communion would never again give it to another, that he would ever afterward refuse it for himself, and that too truly his device was to be 'an oak beaten down by the storm,' with the haughty motto, 'I break, but I do not bend?'"[1] Mgr. Antoine Ricard graphically describes the bitterly melancholy twenty-one years of existence which followed his rupture with the Church which he had probably once loved, and certainly had once served and honored so well. We wish not to dilate on sorrows such as these; the reader will find them depicted in the pages of Ricard, and he will receive new light upon them from the *confidences* of the unfortunate to a friend, revealed in 1886 by Arthur du Bois de Villerabel. Some years after the catastrophe the fallen champion wrote to a friend in Saint-Malo: "I am alone. I perceive time receding, just as a traveller, seated on a naked rock at the edge of a torrent, waits for the stream to become fordable, that he may push on to his night's rest." The end of his life's journey did not come until the winter of 1854, when he was seventy-three years of age. When it became evident, on February 27th, that the hand of death was beckoning to him, his loving niece threw herself on her knees at his bedside and whispered: "Féli, you wish for a priest, do you not?" The obstinate man replied: "No!" In vain the weeping woman besought him to have care of his soul; he continually cried: "Leave me in peace!" Friends removed the niece to the next room as she exclaimed: "It is terrible to me to see my uncle die in this way, for it was he who made me a Christian." Soon afterward the sufferer said: "I wish to be interred among the poor, and like one of them. Put no mark over my grave—not even a simple stone." They told him that the Archbishop of Paris wished to see him. He tried to speak, but seeing that he could not be understood, he made a gesture which might have indicated either impatience or discouragement, and turned

[1] Ricard narrates that Lamennais once said to his nephew that if he were asked to select an emblem indicative of his career he would choose the unbending, though possibly breaking, oak.

his face to the wall. What passed between God and his soul at that moment we shall know on the day of final judgment. His last act of intelligence was an anxious look around the room, and then, as though he had not seen what he had sought, he began to weep. Three days afterward seven or eight persons followed a hearse—one of the kind furnished to the very poor—to the cemetery of Père-la-Chaise. When the grave had been filled, the digger asked: "Do you want a cross?" One of the friends of the deceased, M. Barbet, replied: "No!" Not another word was spoken at the ceremony.

Among the olden disciples who, while reprobating the apostacy of Lamennais, remained personally attached to him until the very end, one of the most worthy and notable was Mathurin Houet, superior of the Oratory at Rennes, who died in 1890. Until the death of "M. Féli," Houet continued to hope and pray for his conversion, and when the master had gone to his dread account, the still loving friend tried to convince himself that the long extinguished luminary of the Church had finally been revived by "that penetrating and inexorable light which appears in our last moments as the dawn of eternity."[1] Enlightened far beyond the danger of superstition, the pious Oratorian nevertheless sought for justification of his confidence in that border land which is occupied by certain children of divine predilection. "Indeed, we may hope," said he one day to M. Roussel, "it has been revealed to a holy religious that M. de Lamennais is saved."[2] Strange as it may appear, Houet was convinced of the good faith of Lamennais. Roussel is of the same opinion. Edmond Biré thinks that such must be the conclusion of all who read the work of Roussel. "It appears to me that the author of 'The Words of a Believer' was not influenced, at the time of his rupture with the Church, by any interested motive. Far from having anything to gain by this rupture, it entailed upon him the loss of comfortable surroundings, of an immense popularity, and of a veritable intellectual royalty. It condemned him to isolation and to powerlessness. It deprived him of numerous devoted and enthusiastic friends, and threw him into a little group of sectarians who were foes of every ideal and of every grandeur. He was one of the grandest geniuses of his day, and perhaps he was its greatest writer. Nothing would have been easier than for him to have satisfied his ambition, if he had any, by a change of opinions. He derived from his persistency no other profit than greater pov-

---

[1] Letter of Lamennais to the Marquis de Coriolis, July 7, 1830, in the *Correspondence*, edited by Forgues, vol. ii., p. 147.

[2] Roussel, *ubi supra*, vol. i., p. 6.

erty and a long imprisonment.[1] Therefore his life testifies to his sincerity. If it were necessary, other witnesses would testify to it. I allude to all those friends of his early life, who, though profoundly grieved by his apostasy, remained attached to him."[2] Biré errs when he contends that Lamennais was influenced by no interested motive when he refused submission to the teaching authority of the Church. He was influenced by pride, than which no wealth or its attendant luxury and sensuality can dominate more the intellectual man who has once preferred its allurements to the empire of truth. And the pride of Lamennais was not that inflating sentiment which actuates the ordinary man. It was not that comparatively harmless bubble which should rather be termed vanity. The pride of Lamennais was, in the words of Gregory XVI., *Superbia Satanica.* At times it frightened himself. He tells us how, when only eight years of age, his nurse was leading him along the ramparts of Saint-Malo, while the sea was being agitated by a violent tempest, and how the sight so affected him that "he thought that he discerned the Infinite and saw God." Then, astonished at what was passing in his soul, he said of the heedless crowd around him: "They behold what I behold, but they do not see what I see." Often when narrating this episode of his childhood, the mature Lamennais would say: "Whenever I think of that distant time I tremble at the recollection of that haughty sentiment in a boy of eight years."[3] In 1809, when he was twenty-seven years of age, he wrote to Bruté: "You are right; one page, one line, one word of St. Francis de Sales or of the "Imitation" is far superior to all these miserably contentious pamphlets which only dry up the soul—mine especially, already so arid. My God! what has plunged me into this unhappy state? Pride! Yes, pride; every day I perceive that truth."[4] After the publication of the first volume of his "Essay on Indifference," he thus expressed his opinion of the projected second volume: "The second will be much more valuable. I shall develop a new system of defence of Christianity against incredulists and heretics, which will be extremely simple, but which will be so rigorously demonstrative that, unless one is prepared to deny his own existence, he will perforce repeat the Creed to the very end."[5] No one ever dared to contradict Lamennais. When he was not sure of the assent of his company, he either showed his irritation or wrapped himself in silence. Sometimes, however, a more than ordinarily candid

[1] On December 26, 1840, Lamennais was condemned to a year's imprisonment and a fine of 2000 francs, because of his pamphlet, *The Country and the Government.*

[2] Biré, *History and Literature*, p. 305, Lyons, 1895.

[3] Blaize, *loc. cit.*, vol. i., p. 8.

[4] Roussel, *loc. cit.*, vol. i., p. 22.

[5] La Gournerie, *loc. cit.*, letter of February 22, 1818.

admirer would venture to warn him of the risks he was running. Thus, in the summer of 1825, the chief luminary of the French bar, Berryer, having listened at La Chênaie to a most eloquent exposition of some of those audacious theories which the master afterward developed in his "Outlines of a Philosophy," felt that he was captivated; but he cried: "My friend, you frighten me. You will become a sectarian; and I foresee that you will lose the empire which you now exercise over me." Lamennais replied: "Sooner than do that, would that I could return to the womb of my mother."[1]

The works which Lamennais produced during the years of his separation from the Church were worthy of the author of the "Words of a Believer." In 1835 appeared a collection of extracts from those articles in the "Avenir" and the "Mémorial Catholique," which had entailed his condemnation; and in his preface he excuses his changes of opinion, both religious and political, by a law of progress in the human mind, the effects of which he has experienced. For the reader must know that during the early years of the Restoration our publicist had been more royalist than the king. When he became proprietor and editor of the "Conservateur" and of the "Drapeau Blanc," he seemed to have but one idea, namely, that there was safety for France and for the king in absolute monarchy alone. In the orthodox portion of his career he gloried in being a prophet raised by God to purge the French Church of Gallicanism. But even before he published the "Words of a Believer," he had deserted the ranks of the ultramontane theologians, and had enrolled himself among such of the Gallican jurisconsults as were really hostile to the independence of the Church, and who were condemned by the saner portion of the Gallican publicists. As an excuse for this change of attitude, Lamennais pleaded: "In the war which I once waged against you I was too much of the soldier; I perceived only one side of the question. Your parliaments have been reproached for their many great resistances against ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but they have rendered great services to society, and without their barrier against Roman usurpations, Rome would have seized on everything, and the priest would have become a king." Well did Boyer say that Lamennais, during his later career, condemned as nonsense every truth which he had once affirmed to be an axiom and a principle. In 1836 the "Affairs of Rome" appeared; in 1838 the "Book of the People"; in 1840 an "Outline of a Philosophy"; in 1846 a "Translation of the Gospels," with democratic and irreligious

[1] After his return to Paris, Berryer narrated this episode to Laurentie. See the articles on "The Abbé de Lamennais," by Laurentie, in the Paris *Union* for March, 1854. Also the *Mèlanges*, by Laurentie, vol. ii., p. 714.

commentaries. In the "Outline," Lamennais tried to reconcile Christianity and pantheism. Like all pantheists, he rejected the Christian idea of creation; but he contended that God indeed created, though out of His own substance. According to this aberration, the divine intelligence at first conceived all the types of creation; and then, when God wished to actuate these types as created forces, He placed a limit to His infinite power, and the created forces came into being. Created spirits were actuated by God's placing a limit to His infinite intelligence. In fine, God placed a limit to His own infinite life, and thus completed what we see as life; He did this by attraction in the physical, and by love in the superior order. Every force in the universe, therefore, is the divine force and power—God the Father, with limitation. Every intelligence is the divine—the Son, with limitation. All life, all love, is the very life of God, with limitation. The force which is in us is really and substantially the force of God; our intelligence, which tries to find truth, is substantially God's own; our will, weak and vacillating as it is, is substantially God's will. Of course, Lamennais affected to modify what was an absolute deification of the universe. Although maintaining the idea of unity of substance, he held that the infinite substance, precisely because of the limitation which it receives on becoming finite, is essentially different from what it was in its infinite state. Thus he affected to preserve an essential difference between God and creatures.

The entire theory of the "Outline" rests on this distinction of a difference between God and the universe, which is not substantial but essential. Substantially, they are identical; essentially, they are different; although substantially identical with the infinite, the finite is nevertheless essentially distinct from the infinite. And when Lamennais is asked for a reason for this distinction between a substantial and an essential difference, he replies that it is a mystery. "It is the mystery of creation; and it would be absurd to try to penetrate it, since we know that substance is radically incomprehensible to finite beings." The reader shall judge whether the subtleties of Lamennais save him from pantheism.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

THE NEW POLITICAL ISSUE IN IRELAND.

IT had long been a truism that Ireland's discontent over the Act of Union was founded upon no sentimental ground of grievance. The substantial reasons which underlay that dangerous feeling have long been apparent to those who are conversant with her financial and economic condition as a result of that arrangement. They had often been lucidly exposed by such adepts in complicated questions as the late Mr. O'Neill Daunt, Sir Joseph Neill McKenna, Mr. Mitchell-Henry, and other capable authorities. But it is only within the past few months that they have received the public attention which their vast importance demands. Now they have assumed the dimensions of a great international issue, and have challenged the attention of the whole world. The discussion has already changed the entire face of the long political struggle in Ireland, and introduced new and unexpected elements into the situation. Many readers may desire some light upon this exceedingly interesting development in Irish affairs, and if they have patience to follow this brief exposition it will help to clear the field.

For the first time since the Union passed from the stage of controversy into law, representatives of the aristocratic caste in Ireland have taken a public part with representatives of the electors in demanding redress of grievances which both classes feel to be intolerable for freemen. This is nothing short of a phenomenon. Apathetic regarding all other questions which the masses of the people considered to be of a national character, the landed nobility and gentry have at last awakened to the fact that they have interests of a substantial kind at stake in the incidence of imperial taxation, and some of them have shown that they are ready to defend those interests by vigorous action. It is not germane to the purpose of this paper to consider the wide field of Irish politics generally, or the hopes and speculations which the advent of these unexpected allies has quickened in the recognized political champions in Ireland. It is enough to say that the dawning of a better day is already confidently looked for, and if prudence and good sense prevail with all classes, this sanguine hope may soon be a thing of reality.

At the period when the Act of Union was arranged, the economic conditions as between Great Britain and Ireland differed widely from those which now obtain. The respective populations

of the two countries did not display the enormous disparity which they exhibit to-day. They might be taken, roughly speaking, as showing a ratio of about one to two. But the disproportion in comparative wealth bore no analogy to this ratio. The loose figures which were used as a basis for the assessment of the respective shares of imperial taxation showed that the revenue of Great Britain was about ten times as large as that of Ireland, yet the original proposal of Mr. Pitt was that Ireland's contribution to the general taxation should be in the ratio of two to fifteen. Mr. Grattan challenged the data upon which this estimate was founded. It was given to that great man to possess the keenest analytical power in statistical matters, together with the faculty of treating far-reaching proposals from the loftiest standpoints, and reasoning from particles to great principles. He maintained that the financial estimates of the minister were built upon a dishonest foundation. The revenue of Ireland, he showed in a series of masterly speeches, was overstated, while that of Great Britain was not fairly acknowledged.

One needs but little statistical discernment to perceive that this objection was well taken. Two years before that period there had been a formidable rebellion in Ireland. The cost of overcoming this had been added to the Irish public debt. Before the rebellion that debt amounted to four million pounds, and, after its close, by this seemingly plausible device, it had been raised to nearly twenty-seven millions. But the injustice of the proceeding was palpable. It was patent to all that the rebellion was a part of the whole scheme of Union, deliberately planned and carried out. Its cost was entirely saddled upon Ireland, and it was arranged that the entire Irish debt was to remain separate from that of Great Britain until such period as the effect of the respective taxation of the two countries had made an amalgamation of the two exchequers feasible. By an artful manipulation of the accounts this merging was effected in the year 1817. Mr. O'Neill Daunt, in the course of one of his lucid papers on the subject, exhibited the gross results of this system of cooking the accounts in the following succinct statement:

	British Debt.	Annual Charge.	Irish Debt.	Annual Charge.
1801,. .	£450,504,984	£17,718,851	£28,545,134	£1,244,463
1817,. .	734,522,104	28,238,416	112,704,773	4,104,514

How this enormous change in the financial condition of the country was brought about within so brief a period as seventeen years requires some explanation. The process may be fitly described as a gigantic feat in state legerdemain. While drawing away from Ireland the wealth which had previously kept her in-

dustrial resources going and paid her public demands, a burden of taxation was placed upon her shoulders which it was impossible for the people to meet. Of this the ministry had been solemnly warned, but they treated the monition with contempt. The close of the first fiscal year under the new system showed, as had been anticipated, a great deficit, but this, instead of being written off as uncollectable, was carried over to the following year's account on the debtor side. The next year showed a similar result: another deficit and another addition to the national debt. This process went on, until the Irish debt was made to bear such a proportion to the English debt as fulfilled the condition laid down in the Act of Union for the amalgamation of the two exchequers. During the brief period of seventeen years the national debt of Ireland, which stood in the year of Union in the ratio of one to sixteen and a half, had been piled up till it stood in the proportion of one to seven and a half. Two years before the Union Ireland had, practically speaking, no public debt; seventeen years' connection with wealthy England loaded her with a liability of nearly six hundred million dollars, and made her a partner in England's leviathan national debt, whose foundations have apparently been laid to last forever.

It is not in the power of these bare statistics to convey any just image of what lies behind their passionless record. To comprehend the significance of the disastrous change which those few years of Union rule wrought in Ireland, it is necessary to examine the subject from a broader standpoint than that of the mere statistician. We must survey the social and industrial position of Ireland before and after the great change by the light of the records which have come down to us, and mark the effects which the pauperization of a people have upon their moral temperament as well as upon their immediate material condition. To-day we see a peasantry and a working population languid, listless and destitute of hope of betterment; and a business community devoid of enterprise save in one part of the island, where the loyalty of the people to the English interest has gained the favor of the ruling classes and some support for the industry of the population. Outside of Ulster there is little but agriculture to engage the energies of the working-classes. A few large breweries and distilleries and bacon-curing establishments, with here and there a woollen factory, form the chief relics of the once extensive trade of the country. At the period of the Union there was a flourishing paper trade in the country, with a great output of books and periodicals. Forty paper mills stood on the banks of the Liffey; to-day there is not one. In a couple of years after the removal of the seat of the legislature to London, half the shopkeepers of Dublin had

been driven into bankruptcy as a consequence of the transference of trade. Both in Dublin and Cork there had been before the Union a thriving trade in silk, manufactured in these centres by colonies of weavers, originally French Huguenots, who had fled from France at the period of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. That trade has now disappeared. There were also glass-works and wall-paper factories, besides many other industries no longer in existence. Cottage industries were many; hand-looms were to be found in many of the homes of the peasantry; the domestic spinning-wheel was quite commonly seen as a household appendage. England, with her enormous increase in machine power and factory enterprise, has absorbed nearly all the trade which kept Irish looms and spinning-wheels busy, flooding the market with shoddy clothing and wretched machine-made boots and shoes instead of the substantial and well-made clothing and foot-gear which the old race of tailors and shoemakers formerly supplied. The system of absentee landlordism drew an immense revenue constantly out of the country, all of which, or nearly all, had previously been spent among the people at home. As a consequence of these accumulated disasters, and the partial failure of crops, the country was scourged with successive famines of frightful proportions within six years—one in the year 1817 and the next in 1822. Then the agricultural industry, which had received an impetus owing to the wars with Napoleon, sustained a serious blow upon the cessation of hostilities after Waterloo, and something akin to their death-stroke when England adopted a free-trade policy and threw her ports open to the cereal products of the world. The awful famine of 1847 came as the culmination of these misfortunes, ruining thousands of landholders as well as slaying hecatombs of agrarian toilers. This was the price of the first half-century of legislative union with the richest country in the world.

In this cursory survey of a nation's decline, account has been taken merely of the material losses inflicted by the amalgamation of the two legislatures. It is impossible to form any adequate estimate of the moral losses inflicted upon Ireland by the transference of the centre of intellectual activity to an alien capital. Dublin was, previous to that event, the home of the native aristocracy, and their taste and generosity had made it a splendid and progressive metropolis. Architects, artists and decorators had been attracted thither, and the mansions of the gentry became palaces of art and luxury, the wreck of whose splendor may still be seen in many parts of the city. It was also a literary centre of high rank. All this disappeared after the Union. How far this misfortune affected the progress of the country in general can only be now a matter of speculation. It is easy to sum up all that the imperial govern-

ment has done for the advancement of the higher life in Ireland since it assumed control of her purse. Trinity College and the Royal Dublin Society were the only agencies which existed for the preservation of learning and scientific research until half a century ago, and the former was exclusively utilized for the benefit of the Protestant ascendency, while the latter was the result of the voluntary effort of a few liberal-minded individuals to rescue the antiquities of the country from ruin and foster at the same time the material resources of the present for the general benefit. The establishment of Maynooth College ought not to be attributed to any desire to promote the country's welfare, inasmuch as it was confessedly done for a selfish imperial purpose. The fact that it has proved an inestimable blessing to the cause of religion must not be credited to any desire on the part of the British Government to further the interests of the Catholic religion. We must not forget that, speaking in Parliament thirty years after the Maynooth grant was voted, Sir Robert Peel declared, as prime minister, that " he felt a profound distrust of the Catholic religion."

It is simply amazing to observe the way in which the statements of the English side of this subject have blinded historians. Alison, for instance, who was a painstaking and, on the whole, a conscientious writer, seems to have been completely deceived by the pretensions of the English press that Ireland was being treated with extreme generosity by the wealthier partner. He speaks of the extraordinary munificence of England in the famine year of 1823, when about three hundred thousand pounds was sent over to Ireland through private generosity, in order to avert mortality from starvation. Then a sum of a hundred and seventy thousand pounds was voted for public works, and this seems to be the whole measure of the help given by government for the relief of urgent distress. In the same passage he lays stress upon the generosity of government in voting five hundred odd thousand pounds for the Irish police force. Any ordinary reader would imagine that Alison was a writer who took care to inform himself of the truth of what he wrote, and the soundness of the inferences which he philosophically draws. But how shallow and unreliable he is, after all, is easily seen by any one who is conversant with the truth about this period of Irish history. Practically speaking, the government gave nothing toward the relief of distress in Ireland at the period referred to. Expenditure on public buildings is nothing more than profitable outlay, and it is to be noted that under the Act of Union Ireland was bound to have her share of public money for such works, but did not get another penny for similar purposes until ten years ago, when, after sixty years' neglect, she succeeded in getting a grant for a national museum in Dublin.

The police grant is a matter of a totally different character. Sir Robert Peel is the inventor of this police, which is still connected with his memory in a nickname of contempt. The force was out of all proportion to the needs of any country supposed to be governed on constitutional lines. It is nothing else but a large standing army, kept in the country not to preserve the peace, but to overawe the people and pry into every movement of their daily lives. This police force has been the marvel and the annoyance of every visitor to Ireland for the past seventy years. Its members are ubiquitous, menacing, meddlesome. There are over thirteen thousand of these idle men distributed over the country, watching everything in the interest of the ruling power, and forwarding notes of the smallest happenings to the government daily. Moreover, on the pension list there are six thousand superannuated policemen, mostly able-bodied men. There are besides a thousand or more of a local force in Dublin, so that Ireland is the most police-governed country in the world. It was not the country's needs that called for this plethora of police, but the policy of England. This fact is admitted in the payment of half the cost of the force by the imperial government.

Now, the motive of maintaining this huge police force is quite evident. It is merely to keep up the pretence of constitutional government by calling it a civil force. But it is really a military force, inasmuch as its members receive a military training and go on duty every day with a military equipment. Behind this huge force there is the standing army of the military establishment, ranging normally from twenty-six thousand to thirty thousand men. So that Ireland is still, after a century of so-called union with England, held under military rule, a country at all times in a state of siege.

Let us turn aside for a moment to contrast this state of affairs with that which we find in Scotland. There the military garrisons do not usually exceed three thousand, and the police is entirely a matter for local adjustment. It does not require any preternatural sagacity to discover, looking at these facts, that Scotland is allowed to share the full benefits of the British Constitution, because the people are satisfied with British rule, while the Irish see no particular reason to love it. The Irish cling to their old faith and their national tradition, while the Scotch have fallen in with what they consider the inevitable.

A similar rule of overmanning prevails in the other branches of the public service in Ireland. The judiciary is much beyond what the public requirements demand. The salaries of the higher judges are enormous. To the lord chancellor a yearly stipend of eight thousand pounds is paid, and the policy with regard to pen-

sions is decidedly liberal. Each retiring lord chancellor receives a yearly salary of four thousand pounds, and, as these officials go out with the government, there have been as many as three of them at the same time on the pension list. Viceroys are paid twenty-five thousand pounds per annum, with a palatial residence thrown in. The chief secretaries are likewise liberally provided for at the public expense.

Besides this frightful load of imperial taxation, the country has to bear a heavy burden of local charges, and this is where the pretence that Ireland is treated as an integral part of the kingdom disappears. Last year the English and Scotch farmers received, under the provisions of the Agricultural Rating Act, grants in relief, from the imperial treasury, amounting to more than a million and a half pounds. Ireland was excluded from the benefits of that statute. This is a most important feature in the consideration of the whole question. It sweeps away the flimsy pretence that no difference exists between the two countries in fiscal matters. Although the respective exchequers of the two nations have been amalgamated for governmental purposes, the two peoples are totally distinct as taxable communities.

A simple statement of the actual fact as regards money matters might appear to put this whole question into a nutshell.

Previous to the Union the tax per head for national purposes in Ireland was nine shillings. Since the Union the Irishman's contribution has been gradually augmented, till it now stands at forty-nine shillings. Local rates in England have got great help from the Imperial exchequer. In Ireland they have received no such help. In England the gross taxation, imperial and local, does not amount to much more than half per head of what the Irishman is called upon to bear; and it has been shown by Sir Robert Giffen that the wealth of England stands in comparison to that of Ireland as twenty-two to one.

It is at this point that we are called upon to pause and reflect upon the fallacy of mere figures when they appear to be leading us to a certain line of deduction. As there is no chain stronger than its weakest link, so the power of a people to bear taxation can never be measured from its lowest point upward. The square of its minimum, in an ascending scale, would appear, rather, to be the just scale of measurement. The man who is taxed to his last dollar of revenue has no plank between him and ruin, in case of ordinary mischance, while the man with a comfortable balance to his credit, taxed only in the same ratio on his income, is subject to no hardship whatever. This is precisely the case with regard to the Irishman and the Englishman. After allowing the very modest sum of twelve pounds yearly for the maintenance of

each individual in Ireland, the total income of Ireland is seen to be taxed down to the narrow margin of one-fifth of the whole. On the other four-fifths the taxpayers are mulcted to the last farthing. In England, on the other hand, only one-ninth of the surplus income is called upon to contribute to the public purse. This is the ratio fixed by Sir Robert Giffen's evidence. On the average well-to-do man in England, therefore, there is not, strictly speaking, any real pressure of taxation, while in Ireland the screw is more crushing and remorseless than that of the Turkish tax-farmers in Armenia.

It was this view of the case which mainly led Sir James Caird, a few years ago, to declare that from a vast majority of the small farms in Ireland economic rent had entirely disappeared. Is there any reason to conclude that the situation has altered for the better since this impartial witness made that startling declaration? Unhappily, the facts all prove that the very contrary is the case. The population has decreased by at least a quarter of a million since he made the statement, and it needs no political economist to prove that the loss of population means loss of so much national wealth. It is safe to estimate the money loss to Ireland at a hundred pounds per individual. Therefore the country has lost twenty-five million pounds in money since Sir James Caird published that memorable statement in the London "Times."

Nor is this all. One of the most melancholy features of the annual agricultural returns for Ireland is the steady increase in the quantity of land going out of cultivation. Thousands of acres disappear every year and become weed-grown common or desolate moorland. Under the silent operation of a withering peace the same results are being wrought in Ireland as in Gaul on the downfall of the Roman power. The country is fast relapsing into a state of nature. It sounds startling, but it is none the less true, that the yearly decline of crops, taken at an average, resulted in a money loss to the country of twenty-four million pounds (a hundred and twenty million dollars) for the past forty years. This is neither guess-work nor romance, but the cold calculation of statisticians given before the Royal Commission. What is the world to think of the policy which works in such a groove as this? Are they statesmen who pursue it, or are they persons of ordinary common-sense?

It may be well to look a little further into this branch of the examination in order to satisfy ourselves of the actuality of the thing and note how the ruin has been brought about. According to the tables produced for the purposes of the Royal Commission the average yearly production of wheat has fallen since 1850 from 5.7 to 1.2 million cwts.; of oats from 30.6 to 18.3 million cwts.;

turnips, potatoes and other crops have fallen off in a similar proportion. It has been contended that this immense decline has been compensated for by a large increase in the number and value of live stock, but the statistics show that the political economist who argues this way is wrong, inasmuch as the total value of live stock in Ireland is at present lower than it was in 1869.

Thus we see three forces conjointly working toward the shrinkage and decay of Ireland. In the first place, a large and steady loss of population; in the next, a decrease in the cultivated area in proportional ratio to this diminution; and in the third, a huge addition to the burdens of those who are left in the island. It is an axiom of statecraft that a fool can govern in a state of siege. Practically this is the only sort of government which Ireland has had since the time of the Union, and her condition now is one upon which her rulers may well ponder. What will be the verdict of posterity upon their intellectual claims when the truth about the nineteenth century comes to be written? Ireland and India will be found branded on the escutcheon of England in characters of fire, a stigma of lasting discredit and a record of combined heartlessness and incompetency.

There is much more in this downfall of Ireland as an accusation against the ruling power than appears from a study of the mere statistics of her decline. One has to examine the question from the point of view of Ireland's natural capabilities. Gifted with a soil the most fertile and a climate the most mild, the natural products of the country are normally abundant enough for a population of double the number it ever attained. But owing to the false economical system enforced by alien rule, those natural products are diverted from their proper use, the maintenance of the inhabitants, and shipped to foreign countries, while the remnant of the agricultural population left in the island are compelled to live, for the most part, on Indian meal, potatoes and non-nutritive diet generally. It is asserted by social economists of authority that the soil of Ireland is capable of supporting sixteen millions of inhabitants in comfort, and in an admirable work by the late Sir Robert Kane, on the "Material Resources of Ireland," the means by which a population of at least twelve millions could find employment and support by the development of the mineral and other industrial resources and the reclamation of the five or six million acres of waste lands are scientifically exhibited. Not a single step has been taken since the work was published, fifty years ago, to give effect to any of its recommendations.

To-day Ireland "is more dependent on agriculture than it was a hundred years ago; its wealth is less; its population no greater." This is the conclusion of one of the Royal Commissioners after a

survey of the facts disclosed by the fiscal and statistical evidence produced before the commission. What a commentary on the roseate picture painted in the promises of Pitt and the menaces of Lord Clare a hundred years ago! Terse and terrible in meaning as the summing up is, it might be easily intensified. If the proposition were put in this way—for the latter half of this hundred years the population has fallen away one-half, or very nearly, while the annual taxation has had five millions (twenty-five millions of dollars) added to its amount, or, in other words, doubled, which means to the halved population quadrupled—if these were the terms in which the equation were stated—which is, indeed, only the statement of the literal fact—who could fail to realize in some measure the dreadful significance of the summary to a miserable population? Nor, of a verity, is there any real knowledge of the working of this vast mechanism of misery to be had until we search below the cold figures and tables and sift the *viva voce* evidence of the officials of the Local Government Board. Those officials are, by the nature of their duties, made familiar with the material circumstances of the people of each locality. They examine the accounts of the 159 poor-law unions, go through the work-houses, speak to the inmates, and make a close study of both the cause and effect of pauperism on its own ground and in the most practical way.

There is another board which dives deeper still into the workings of all the agencies of impoverishment, and patiently tracks their operation among not merely the families of the poor, but the very individuals of each family. This is known as the Congested Districts Board, and its chief official is a man who has gained universal respect for his humane and sympathetic disposition and conscientious discharge of a most trying and delicate function, a gentleman named Micks. His evidence is perhaps the most important of any taken before the Royal Commission, for it was founded on the most painstaking investigation and actual personal knowledge of the facts which he brought forward. Its chief value is in the answer it furnishes to the shallow taunt of the ignorant commentator, that excessive indulgence in strong drink is the cause of the Irishman's impoverishment.

As there has been, as we have seen, a deliberate attempt to prejudice the general mind on this subject, by misstating the real issue, it is well to take up the charge here, and once for all dispose of it by a simple statement of the facts. In the area dealt with by the Congested Districts Board is contained one-sixth of the whole extent of Ireland, and on this sterile soil a population of five hundred and fifty thousand persons vegetate—for they can hardly in truth be said to live. The depths of poverty here

sounded have no parallel, possibly, in any other part of the world where civilized rule is supposed to exist. And yet this area does not contain the worst: there are tracts outside in which the misery is deeper, and these are shut out from the operations of this Board, whose function is partial relief, by reason of the population not forming twenty per cent. of that of the whole country, as the Act of Parliament, which is its authority, requires. Careful returns have been obtained from each family within the society's supervision, and these show the incomes upon which the people are forced to subsist. The highest income was twenty-eight pounds (a hundred and forty dollars) a year; the lowest, eight pounds (forty dollars). The average number of the family is five and a half. Let any one picture, if it be possible, a family of five persons—perhaps six—living on a weekly income of about seventy-five cents per week, and then consider the charge advanced against these people, of being extravagant in drink expenditure! Wretched as these incomes are, the machinery of taxation is fine enough to embrace them in its clutches. On an income of eleven pounds per annum, the direct taxation reached to one-fourth of the outlay for necessaries, chiefly on tea and tobacco. On the highest income taken by Mr. Micks, namely, twenty-eight pounds, six pounds five shillings went to the revenue treasury by the same means.

Mr. Micks's testimony on this point is emphatic. He never, he said, saw any sign of drinking or drink in any of the houses; in Donegal, he added, where the congested districts mostly lie, most of the people are abstainers. Here, then, we have more than half a million of the Irish population ascertained to be guiltless of the charge of wasting their substance on drink. Nor is the stratum immediately above that embraced in Mr. Micks's survey open, as a rule, to the same imputation. The small farmer and laborer are too poor to afford alcoholic drink. Perhaps, when the farmer goes to market on a Saturday, he may indulge in a pint of porter or two, or a glass of whiskey, but for the rest of the week he is practically a teetotaler. This is the rule; and the statement is made as the result of large personal observation. Now let us see what is the amount of drink actually consumed, and who are the classes who consume it.

In the fiscal year 1893–94 the total revenue derived from spirits, wine, beer and tobacco in Ireland was £4,848,489. This sum looks large, but let us examine how it is made up. The duty on spirits ranges from ten shillings to twelve shillings per gallon, according to strength. One can buy in the distillery the best quality of spirits for seven shillings a gallon, but before he can remove it from the bonded store its cost will be over twenty shillings, the

difference between its market price and the gross cost representing the government's desire to check intemperance and pay its soldiers and all the paraphernalia of state. A careful analysis of the returns shows that the whole consumption of spirits in the country in the year selected, which is a fairly typical one, did not amount to more than one gallon per head in the whole twelve months. If one-eighth of the whole population were to consist of moderate drinkers, imbibing each one glass per day, they would consume the whole amount, leaving seven-eighths compulsory or voluntary abstainers. This is the whole case for Ireland's drunkenness put into a nutshell. It is no guess-work, but the result of the most careful analysis of returns which neither conceal nor exaggerate, being simply recording instruments. Where, then, is the case against Ireland? Where are the proofs of those who so recklessly make it?

In Scotland, as in Ireland, the national beverage is spirits, and the consumption in Scotland, head for head, is double that of Ireland. Yet no one pillories the Scottish population before the world as a bibulous crowd. The Englishman's taste is for beer, and of this he drinks at the rate of thirty-seven gallons per head, infant and adult, in the year. The duty on a gallon of beer is only two pence, as compared with the duty of from ten to eleven shillings on whiskey. Had the duty been arranged on the scale of alcoholic strength in the respective liquors, rather than on the form of alcoholic media, proportionately to the Irish impost, the Englishman's contribution would be a shilling per gallon instead of two pence.

The consumers of spirits, then, in Ireland are the wealthier classes and the denizens of the cities and towns—the working population generally. As we have seen, the ratio of liquor to the population is so small throughout the whole year that a few score hard drinkers, tippling incessantly in the principal places, must be able to account for the whole consumption. The Englishman consumes, on the average, as much spirits as the Irishman, besides these thirty gallons of beer as compared with the Irishman's sixteen gallons, while his consumption of wine, as compared with the Irishman's, is in the ratio of 8 to 5. In considering these significant facts, it must also be borne in mind that the average Englishman is the best-fed man in the world. The abundance of animal food with which he is supplied renders his resort to stimulants inexcusable. The mass of the Irish people, on the contrary, are the worst fed and worst housed of any population in the world, A vast number live on potatoes, meal and skim milk all the year round, and only a small proportion can afford a meat dinner once in the week. Laboring in the fields, and exposed most of the time

to the severity of a proverbially moist and inclement atmosphere, the Irishman's temptations to resort to stimulants are much more powerful than those of his English neighbor.

No doubt there are ethical sides to this element in the problem which admit of no reasoning by analogy or comparison. The lamented Father Mathew would not, in all probability, admit any such plea in the ardor of his crusade against alcohol. But there are ethics in politics as well as in sumptuary habits. If we find a man addicted to the use of an immoderate quantity of intoxicating drink, are we justified in turning that melancholy fact to our own advantage or his ruin? By no sort of casuistry can we ever persuade ourselves that to rob a drunkard is a pardonable breach of the moral law. At the outset it was alleged that concern for the people's moral welfare impelled the imposition of a high rate of duty as a deterrent measure, but experience proved that it did not so operate. Then the tax was made higher and higher as successive budgets demanded additional sums from the people, so that it is impossible to escape the conviction that it was the case of getting the money rather than the moral scruple which prompted the enormous increase.

In the new inquiry which has been suggested by the government, it was intimated that the investigation of accounts should have a wider scope than that of the recent commission. To assent to this alteration by silence, as the Irish representatives appear to have done, was an egregious tactical mistake. Scotland, which was suggested as also having financial complaints, stands on an altogether different footing from Ireland. The question is one absolutely between the two high contracting parties; Scotland has her own set of books and her own special minister in Parliament to look after her interests, and the imperial policy towards her people, since the union of the two Parliaments in 1702, has been the very antithesis of that adopted toward the people of Ireland. Full equality in political matters, absolute impartiality in religious affairs, generosity in the promotion of national industries, respectful regard for national sentiment and tradition, have been the steady characteristics of English policy toward the people north of the Tweed ever since that time. There is no *locus standi* for Scotland in this controversy, and the intrusion of her claim could have no other purpose than that of embarrassing the previous question. But indeed the action of the government as to the whole transaction has been illogical and evasive. It is plainly a disingenuous after-thought to throw doubts upon the impartiality of the commission by suggesting that the majority of its members were supporters of Home Rule. No matter what their predilections were, their findings were based

upon the evidence of witnesses who could never be suspected of any desire to favor the Irish claims. These witnesses included one of the greatest living authorities on statistics and applied political economy, Sir Robert Giffen; an English official, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Sir Edward Hamilton, who supervises the ledger of the whole United Kingdom; Sir Alfred Milner, Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue; Mr. Murray, Chairman of the Board of Customs; Mr. Pittar, principal of the Statistical Office of the Board of Customs; all of whom dealt exhaustively in their evidence with the great salient facts of international account involved in the inquiry. Besides these English officials there were examined a large number of witnesses connected, under the wing of Dublin Castle, with the financial details of Irish government, so that the great bulk of the testimony given before this commission might in the aggregate be regarded as in no sense friendly to the intent of the investigation, save in so far as it related to a true discovery and a just balancing of accounts. Fifteen out of eighteen chief witnesses examined were paid servants of the Crown, the statements they gave were sifted and analyzed by the most painstaking process of examination, and in every case their perfect accuracy was demonstrated in the most unimpeachable way. Neither commissioners nor witnesses suffered themselves to be diverted from the one point which they knew to be the pith of the whole inquiry—namely, how much per head of the population was charged by the government in Ireland, and what proportion this tax bears to the assessment in Great Britain; for this, though not the kernel of the question for Ireland, was the substantial criterion of the manner in which the weightier partner had carried out her part of the Union compact. By what means it is contemplated to neutralize or modify the conclusions based upon the testimony of such a body of witnesses as these no plain mind can surmise. They have covered all the ground legitimately within the ambit of the inquiry, and the evidence is part of the official record of the Victorian Kalends. So far as it extends, it is the last word that can be said upon the case, and in statistical matters the audience never calls for an *encore*.

There are directions in which the scope of the inquiry might, however, be properly extended, if the Irish representatives make an effective effort in Parliament to that end. Not merely the letter of the fiscal relations between the two countries may be put under the microscope, but the spirit in which the provisions of the Union bargain have been observed ought to be taken up and rigidly scrutinized. For instance, why has that decennial revision of the accounts undertaken by Pitt never been carried out? or why those special abatements, which were also provided for in the Act of

Union to meet cases of distress or inability to pay in Ireland, never been attempted? Why, instead of abatement, has there been a piling on of taxes, decade after decade, in utter defiance of those solemn stipulations, and a deaf ear always turned to Ireland's remonstrances? Why, despite the express stipulation about the income tax, was that odious tax extended to Ireland, fifty years after the Union, without a word of excuse for such flagrant pledge-breaking? Why, when it was found that the operation of free trade, which Great Britain had deliberately adopted as an imperial policy, had ruined the whole body of Irish agriculturists, was no abatement made in Irish taxation, and no special legislation to meet her exceptional needs attempted? This certainly was the time for the exemptions and abatements promised at the Union to be allowed, if ever. But, instead of exemption and abatement, this was the period which marks the beginning of an iniquitous system of so-called fiscal reorganization, originating with Mr. Gladstone, under which the whole taxation of Ireland was raised, by a succession of frightful bounds, as much as 58 per cent., and the contribution for imperial purposes, which stood at thirteen million dollars per annum in 1850, by 1860 had been, not slowly, but nearly suddenly, forced up to twenty-seven millions, or an increase of 106 per cent. There is no valid reason why the inquiry should not extend into these amazing facts, nor why it should not go even further back than the middle of the century. A most important Parliamentary paper was issued, for instance, in 1833, showing the remittances of money from the Irish to the British exchequer, and *vice versa*, from 1793 to 1833. By this it is shown that during those forty years Ireland had sent over to England a sum amounting to close upon a hundred million dollars, as imperial contribution, and had received back as expenditure for imperial purposes only forty-one millions. The contention of the London "Times" and the government now is that if Ireland does pay more than her fair proportion of taxation she receives the money back in payment of public expenditure, and that the country, so far from being a benefit financially to Great Britain, is a positive loss. In face of the facts disclosed before the Royal Commission, it requires courage to do this; but it can hardly be said that the courage is of the order which compels admiration.

It is particularly unfortunate that Mr. Gladstone should be *hors de combat* at this phase of the quarrel between England and Ireland. In his prime he was one of the greatest masters of finance that ever held the portfolio of Chancellor of the Exchequer; but he seemed to have lost much of his old facility in figures when he came to draft his scheme of Home Rule for Ireland. It was out of the objections taken to the financial branch of that scheme that

the late Royal Commission originated, as Mr. Gladstone found, on closer examination, that a mistake had been made in the revenue returns which involved a loss of millions to Ireland. The aged statesman did not desire to proceed with the financial proposals until that mistake had been cleared up. The present heads of the administration have had the blunder cleared up and the injustice exposed, and they persist in perpetuating it. Herein we see the difference between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone. It is but just, however, to the rank and file of the Tory party to recognize the fact that this moral obtuseness does not represent the general condition of mind on the subject, for there has been no warmer advocate for redress to Ireland than the late Solicitor-General, Sir Edward Clarke. The Irish members of the Tory party are almost to a man at odds with the government on the subject, and many of them have made speeches on public platforms which, in the mouths of Irish Nationalists, would have invited the attention of the public prosecutor.

In the face of an injustice so flagrant, and an agitation so grave, it is difficult to believe that any British Ministry would have the cynical hardihood to deny redress. Only by going back to historical precedents can we convince ourselves that the attitude of Mr. Balfour on this subject reflects not merely his own cynical turn of mind, but the conscience of English Toryism on questions of simple honesty in commercial dealing. Mr. Balfour cannot destroy the Seventh Commandment with a sneer. If he had any respect for his own ingenuousness he would have hesitated to use so palpable a sophism as that the Irish could settle the question by abstaining from the consumption of the articles which furnished the revenue. On this point he was answered very effectively by Mr. Morley, who challenged him to put his theory into operation in England by proposing an additional duty on beer. Nor was there any greater force in his second contention, which relied on the exemption of Ireland from some forms of taxation imposed in England, such as land-tax, house-tax, and carriage-tax. It is astounding, indeed, that so acute a logician as he usually is, when he wishes, could fail to perceive that this line of argument is at right-angles with his own major premiss seeking to show the impossibility of regarding the countries as separate territory for fiscal purposes. It would require the cheerful hardihood of a Disraeli to maintain such a proposition in the teeth of that recent remarkable piece of differential legislation, the Agricultural Rating Act; but even before its enactment, the discrimination had been established in a score of cases connected more or less with the question of local government. It is idle to contend, as Mr. Balfour did, that England spends more in Ireland than she takes in the shape of

imperial taxation. The statement will not bear the test of analysis; but even if it were strictly true, it is false in constitutional law, inasmuch as the excessive expenditure is made in pursuance of a policy of repression and in open defiance of the terms of what is regarded by the advocates of the Union as a solemn and binding international instrument.

Can it be, after all, that Englishmen of the official Tory type are deficient in moral sensibility, when we find them thus standing up to defend conduct which in other spheres of life brands the perpetrators as criminals and earns penal purgation? Here we behold the country which boasts of being the foremost, the richest, the most magnificent of modern empires convicted of mercilessly fleecing, in defiance of her own engagements, an unhappy sister country rendered the poorest in all the world by the downright misgovernment of the stronger partner, and, when the crime is proved home, evincing neither shame nor the grace to mend, but stoutly maintaining that the injustice must go on.

There are certain classes of public wrong which involve the statesmen who uphold them in no personal moral guilt; but in this case the taint of personal identification with dishonesty comes perilously close to every member of the government and every member of the party which persists in the maintenance of that enormous wrong which has been brought home to their doors. Every individual of the English nation benefits financially, directly or indirectly, by the imposition of an unjust burden on Ireland. Ireland is compelled to spend money she has no right or desire to spend, and Englishmen's pockets are saved exactly so much as Ireland is thus obliged to disgorge above and beyond her fair proportion and outside her bargain. Was any spectacle ever so ignoble as that of a rich and powerful autocrat compelling a poverty-stricken and feeble neighbor to feed him and pay his bills? There is not an iota of exaggeration in the simile; it is literally true if we only extend it from the individual to the aggregation.

When the Liberal-Unionist party was first formed, the ideal which it placed before its mind's eye was to secure for Ireland every advantage which Home Rule could be supposed to bring to that country short of the vital one of placing her affairs within her own management. To this end it was decided by that party that co-operation with the Tories was not outside the pale of legitimate party action. By this time they have been taught the lesson that there is no immunity from punishment for the political crime and dishonor of compounding with one's own conscience. The Tories, secure in their brute majority, do not feel bound to show any gratitude for past services. They do not feel it imperative to assist the Liberal-Unionists in proving that their Irish policy was sincere.

Those Liberal-Unionists who represent Irish constituencies are now in a very unenviable position. They are unable to justify their former opposition to Home Rule, by the only tangible reason they could adduce for opposing it, *i.e.*, the material benefit of the English connection. With the balance altogether on the other side of the account, their reason for political existence has disappeared. They can no longer be regarded as representing anything, and are of no more weight, morally speaking, than so many disembodied spirits. Unless they repent and throw themselves heartily into the Home Rule movement, the period of their political extinction resolves itself into a matter of elementary arithmetic.

Men like Mr. T. W. Russell, who have deluded themselves or sought to delude others into the belief that a large extension of local government, or a system of county councils, would suffice to satisfy the legitimate needs of Ireland, cannot have studied such weighty problems as they deserve. How can it ever be conceived that the best system of county councils that the wisest heads could devise would be able to co-operate for the general good, as a central Parliament must, while their principle rested on the county limit? Local interests must, from the very nature of such assemblies, be the guiding motive in all legislation. How could it be possible, with such a system, to undertake any work of national utility? A convincing proof of the superiority of a national Parliament to any system of lesser authority is found in the eighteen years from 1782 to 1800, when the Irish Parliament was acting unhampered by the London government. During that period, brief as it was, the commerce of the country was placed upon an assured basis of prosperity, its manufactures were fostered, its interests promoted as they never were before. It was before the days of steam communication, but the enlightened spirit of the age is still seen in the splendid system of canals which were then constructed for the transportation of the produce of the inland towns and fields to the different ports. Toward the expense of this water-way the Parliament voted a national contribution of three hundred thousand pounds. Had there only been a system of county councils, such a work, it is perhaps superfluous to say, never could have been carried out, owing to local unwillingness to contribute to the general expense.

Here, then, is the position as between Great Britain and Ireland, after nearly a century of nominal union. The Parliamentary union is maintained, but the union of interests, Mr. Pitt's reason for the amalgamation, is ostentatiously repudiated. Mr. Pitt specifically provided that special consideration should be shown for the financial disabilities of the poorer country, and set up safeguards in the

Act of Union to that end. Lord Salisbury insists that the very opposite principle must continue to guide English ministers. The reference of the subject to another commission is a flagitious make-shift for delay. It transforms what had hitherto been regarded as merely obstinate persistence in an erroneous equation into what might be regarded as an act of deliberate fraud. Strong confirmation to this invidious view of the case is afforded by the action of the leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Arthur J. Balfour, with reference to the opportunity for discussion which was promised the Irish representatives on the subject of the new commission. By one of those Parliamentary technicalities which are so convenient for the purposes of evasion, he contrived to jockey Mr. Dillon when he rose to press for a fulfilment of the undertaking. Legislative legerdemain is a sorry substitute for statesmanship, and no one but a politician who knows he has no case to defend would resort to it. For the moment it may be successful, but it will be against all the facts of reference if a shabby policy of this kind shall ultimately prevail. The claim of Ireland is irresistible, and the united opinion of the injured country is a force against which no adroitness in Parliamentary forms can hope to stand for long.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

THE TRAPPISTS IN ALGERIA.

"MADAGASCAR is declared a French possession." So runs the news of the day; while month by month we, dwellers in its conqueror's country, have noted with somewhat listless interest the daily note of triumph swell louder and deeper in journal and review.

It is a rich and fertile, though uncultivated, country, and its new lords are now busy enumerating the various products which may successfully enrich French coffers from this latest "colony" under their protectorate. Coffee, rice, cotton, vanilla and other tropical products are expected to flourish; but who or what company or administration may be called on to make the yet uncultured wilds fruitful?

A letter, lately made public, from the pen of M. Laroche, the *Protestant* (French) Resident-General of Madagascar, gives official answer to our question:

"M. L'ABBÉ DE LA TRAPPE À STAOUËLI.

"*Monsieur l'Abbé:* As a former Prefect in Algeria, I have retained a lively recollection of the virtues of the Trappists. I have seen with my own eyes the example which they set, their work, the magnificent domain which they have created, the sympathy which, by their hospitality and their good deeds, they have attracted to themselves from every one who comes in contact with them.

"Charged as I am with the great mission of founding a French colony at Madagascar, I want some chosen allies like the Trappists to help me to fulfil this object.

"Would you, therefore, be disposed to send a few of your Fathers to this distant isle? I am ready, for my part, to allot to them whatever concession of land they may wish to have, to look out for whatever is best for them, and to offer them—to guarantee, in a word—the most absolute security, authorizing them to count upon very cordial and special protection from the Resident-General. We will also give them the privilege of free transport from Europe to their projected establishment in Madagascar. The Trappists will, should they accept this proposition, render a special service to the new colony and to civilization in general, and will co-operate in the first ranks of the moral and pacific conquest of a country of which we are, as yet, only military conquerors. Trusting to receive a favorable answer, I beg you to accept, M. l'Abbé, the expression of my high consideration.

"HIPPOLYTE LAROCHE."

Commenting on this letter, a French journalist writes in the "Gaulois" that

"as new parts of France come into being, the republicans themselves bow before the conditions which helped to give birth to France itself, and the self-same government which seeks to exterminate these congregations on the one hand finds nothing better than they to present to barbarians as specimens of French civilization on the other."

The spectacle is, in truth, sufficiently absurd, were it not so unutterably sad; but let us pass for a moment to examine what are the marvels of work and life before which a French Protestant Republican official, in 1896, cannot refrain from a cry of admiration and veneration.

It is no uncommon occurrence in any Catholic country for the hard-worked parish priest or overstrained missioner to seek a brief mental rest and spiritual refreshment at some one of the Trappist monasteries which are scattered here and there over each land—true oases of faith and sanctity in the midst of much coldness of heart and evil in this our day. And so, when a certain country curé, or rector, as English-speaking communities would probably entitle him, proposed to one of his confrères and neighbors, at the end of a very successful mission which the latter had just held in his parish, that they should spend together a few days in retreat at La Trappe d'Aiguebelle, the proposition was accepted willingly, but without the least suspicion of ulterior results—of that long train of auspicious events—the grand apostolate in the future, whence generations yet unborn shall reap the fruit, which God was preparing in a career of which this excursion was the first and initiatory step.

The two priests—they were called l'Abbé Rouanet, Curé of Saïx, and l'Abbé de Martrin, Curé of Tels, in the department of Tarn, and archdiocese of Albi, better known to the historian of the past as the fair and minstrel-haunted province of Languedoc—seem to have made their pilgrimage by diligence; for they journeyed three days and nights without resting ere arriving at Pierrelatte, the nearest village to the far-famed monastery of Aiguebelle. From Pierrelatte the two priests, on pilgrim ways bent, proceeded with some difficulty on foot, bribing a village youth to serve as their guide. They arrived at midnight at the abbey gates, and, tired though he was after his long journey, one of them, the young Abbé de Martrin, betook himself straight to the great dim church to assist, from the visitor's tribune, at the monastic night office. This is always a very striking scene, and is thus described by an American visitor to one of the Trappist monasteries:

"Two o'clock in the morning is the general hour for rising. On Sundays, however, when Matins are sung instead of being merely recited, they rise at one, and on special feasts, called 'doubles,' when the office is unusually long, they rise at midnight, and are then, it must be remembered, up for the day. As the monks sleep in the habit worn during the day, their toilet does not occupy much time, and at five minutes after the ringing of the bell every monk is in his place in the chapel ready to commence the office. And here let me say that this sleeping in their habits is one of their severest penances. The guest-master, who had been forty-six years in the order, told me that it was the only rule he could never grow accustomed to. The Trappists, before each portion of the canonical office, recite the corresponding portion of the

'Little Office of the Blessed Virgin,' and their first duty on going to the chapel in the morning is to recite the Matins and Lauds of the latter. This occupies half an hour, and is followed by half an hour of silent meditation. The monks are obliged by their rule to commit to memory the 'Little Office,' and also all portions of the canonical office of frequent recurrence, and to recite or sing them without lights. The chapel is, therefore, for the first hour in darkness, broken only by the flicker of the tiny flame that tells of the presence of Him to whom they speak. Nothing can be imagined so weird and at the same time so devotional and impressive as this scene. The dim chapel, the altar-lamps, serving only to accentuate the darkness; the ghostly white-robed figures, with their graceful folds of drapery scarcely visible in the surrounding gloom, and through it all the plaintive yet ardent voice of most devout supplication, combine to produce an impression not easily effaced."

The arrival of our visitors falling on the Eve of the Assumption, the office began, of course, at midnight, the feast being one of the "doubles" referred to above. Later on in the same day, a still more striking ceremony took place—the clothing of those novices who had come here to die to the world. One, an officer, knelt before the altar in all the splendor of epaulette and sword, gold lace and braid, his numerous decorations marking him as no neophyte in this world's honors; then, all these gay trappings laid aside, their wearer took his place among the brethren clothed in the rough white garb and with the shaven head of the novice, while, during the High Mass which followed, a priest, well known to our two visitors as one of the most highly esteemed in their own circle of acquaintances, pronounced his final vows as a professed monk.

That same evening, as the Abbot was resting in his cell, after a somewhat fatiguing day, a knock came at his door. It was the young Abbé de Martrin.

"What! you here?" was his joyous exclamation, as, rising to receive his visitor, he beheld the youthful curé. The recognition and delight were mutual, for the Abbot's head being now uncovered, his visitor recognized in him, too, a former fellow-priest and friend, for some time past dead to his acquaintances and to all the world. "You here?" cried Dom Orsise, holding out both hands in cordial greeting.

"Even so, and I believe that God has led me to Aiguebelle to take up my abode here forever!"

"Assuredly!" replied his friend; and then and there the necessary preliminaries were arranged. Léon de Martrin received permission to enter the community on probation the next day, with the hope of being clothed a few days later.

"I have to announce to you," he remarked gaily to his travelling companion during the day, "that I am going to take up my abode here. Continue your retreat by yourself, and return to Albi afterwards. I am not going back."

The abbé Rouanet took this for a joke, as, indeed, it must have sounded from the lips of the lively young curé; but by-and-by the latter repeated his resolve in all sober earnestness. "To-morrow I shall enter the community on trial, and if you just wait here for ten days longer, you will see me clothed in the white robe of a novice!"

And, in fact, next day, the very priest whose profession had so touched him, and who had at once been made novice-master, inaugurated his new dignity by receiving Léon de Martrin as his first new subject.

But we must pause for a moment at the door of the noviciate, to review, as doubtless he reviewed it with his new spiritual guide, the past life of our neophyte.

Léon de Martrin was the first son and second child of a family of ten sons and daughters born to M. and Madame Auguste de Martrin-Donos, a younger branch of the noble family of de Martrin, whose representative, dying childless, had called his cousin to continue the family estate and line in his stead. They were a pious, noble and highly respected family; the father, described as governing his large circle with a happy mingling of gravity and tenderness, "wielding the sceptre of paternal authority with justice and firmness, tempered by devoted care." Madame de Martrin was a mother such as the mothers of saints are not seldom found to be—wholly devoted to her children from their earliest infancy, when, contrary to the usual practice in French noble families, they drew their first sustenance from herself, lisped their first prayers at her knee and gathered their earliest learning from her gentle lips.

Every evening the childish heads were grouped round father and mother, beneath the one great lamp which hung suspended in the salon, and one or other of the children were bidden to read some saint's life aloud to close the day piously together. Almost as soon as little Léon could pronounce his words he, as the elder brother, was the one chosen for this duty, and he wrote of it to his father many years later thus:

"You never guessed, my dear parents, and you in particular, dear father, that it was you who gave me the first impulse towards monastic life. You remember that when I was very young, almost an infant, you set me, during the winter evenings, to read aloud the 'Lives of the Saints.' They were generally monks, hermits, anchorites and others, drawn from the principal saints. I seemed, doubtless, entirely occupied with efforts to read well and without making mistakes, so as not to be found fault with, but all the time my heart was drinking in what I read. I was picturing to myself those good monks at their exercises, and the happiness they reaped from them. God, who makes everything work together for His own ends, thus sowed in me the seeds of religious life, which, germinating within my heart, have brought me where I am now."

Few memories have been recorded of the childish days of Léon

de Martrin. He is described as having been a lively, independent, spirited, yet affectionate, boy, with a natural leaning towards devoting himself to the service of others, inherited or learned from his sweet mother. His biographer tells how, when Léon was about eight years old, a certain general was lunching with the family, during some military manœuvres which took place in the vicinity, and while the elders were at table, little Léon, child-like, found, and delightedly played with, a gun belonging to one of the party. He managed to discharge the gun, which was loaded, and thereby brought down upon himself the paternal wrath; on which, conducted in disgrace before the guest of the house, the good-natured soldier begged forgiveness for the bright-eyed scapegrace, and, struck by his brave bearing, cried: "We will make a general of him!" Some months afterwards the bishop, who had just bestowed on him the sacrament of confirmation, noting the boy's extraordinary piety, cried in like manner: "We will make a bishop of him!" and his biographer notes the double prophecy as foretelling his future career; Abbot in religion and general of a nobler army than that of any earthly country, the white-robed army of St. Bernard and St. Benedict, where the strength of his will, the indomitable energy of his disposition and the natural gaiety of his character, all were destined to serve and further the work for which he was prepared.

In 1827, at the age of nineteen, he entered the Grand Seminairie at Albi as a "philosopher." While here, the piety which he had always shown became yet more pronounced, and he became the centre and director, so to speak, of a little confraternity or sodality of his fellow-students. Their object was a sort of apostolate—the practice of penance and of giving good example to others. Often, if they heard of any special affliction fallen upon the Church, their youthful director would organize a quarantine of expiation, during which each of the associates took one day on which to offer himself as a victim in expiation to the Divine Justice, sometimes feeding on bread and water, or imposing upon himself some severe mortification. Léon de Martrin showed wonderful talent in governing his little congregation, in stimulating their zeal and in attracting reinforcements; so much so that before very long the whole college was penetrated with their spirit of penance. It was the beginning of a life-long apostolate. One day a missionary, seeking recruits for a near mission to the Oceanic isles, made an appeal for subjects, with the bishop's leave, to the young seminarists, and Léon de Martrin was among the first to give in his name as a candidate; but political events afterwards put an end to the whole undertaking, and Léon continued his preparations for the secular priesthood.

It would appear that while studying for orders, de Martrin was

continually haunted by a sense of some further vocation, some secret call from God, the precise nature of which he was wholly unable to fathom. Neither director nor friend being able to solve his difficulties or calm his uneasiness, he determined to remain as far as possible in an attitude of waiting, watching for some indication of the Will of God in his regard. In this frame of mind he received the Sacrament of Ordination on the 22d of December, 1832, at the hands of Mgr. d'Astros, Archbishop of Toulouse, his own diocesan being blind and unable to officiate, and his ordination vows were a promise to follow implicitly that divine and "kindly light" which is never invoked in vain.

In accordance with this attitude of passive waiting upon the divine guidance, his first step after ordination was to request one of his maternal uncles, who possessed a certain amount of influence and was prepared to use it on Léon's behalf, to make no effort whatever for that object. Entering M. Bermond's study one day, the young priest thus addressed his uncle: "Uncle, I have come to ask you a favor." Then, as the latter smiled assent, believing the favor asked to be some good living or other advantageous post, "I beg of you," he went on, "to ask nothing for me; God will provide something." His request was granted; those who would fain have exerted themselves in the matter remained passive, and the result was that three months later all his former companions were provided with curacies or other suitable posts, while he alone remained idle. At length he was named curate of a neighboring village, and entered for the first time on priestly work. It did not satisfy his soul, and ever the same thought haunted him, of some unknown and higher vocation. Often and often did he use his filial privilege, and, going over to Albi, would lay his doubts and fears before the archbishop, a sympathetic and kindly man, who seems to have at once taken a special fancy to his young priest, and tried his best to make him content with the "common task" of a country "vicaire's" lot. "My son," he said to him one day, "you tell me nothing definite; all this is very vague."

"Monseigneur, if all was clear to me, I should have no need of guidance," answered the young priest gently.

At one time it seemed as though a light were to be thrown upon his path in life by a somewhat curious incident. As the young curate was seated at supper with his superior one evening, a carriage stopped at the door, and a tall, gaunt, commanding-looking figure, preceded by a man bearing a lantern, strode into the little dining-room, and saluted them gravely. "I am M. Paraudier, a missionary," he said. "I am on my way to Mazamet; the public coach, by which I go, is waiting for me outside. The archbishop

has placed at my disposal some of his priests to help me in conducting a mission which is to begin to-morrow. Monsieur le vicaire, you are to be one of them!"

He paused for a moment, then, without giving time for a reply, turned on his heel, and, adding, "It is decided, I shall await you!" he disappeared.

The retreat duly took place, and the young missioner's eloquence and burning words took such happy effect, that the Abbé Paraudier proposed taking him to Constantinople, an arrangement which Mgr. de Gualy, the archbishop of the diocese, appears to have vetoed, desiring, no doubt, to retain the services of the zealous young priest for his own diocese. After being transferred successively to two parishes which needed specially skilled and careful management, the Abbé de Martrin found himself placed in charge of the parish of Tels, not very far from his own home. Here the strange doubts and questionings which had ever haunted him returned with redoubled force, and no word which bishop or friend addressed to him brought any light to his troubled spirit. He made a retreat with the Jesuits at Toulouse, to gain light as to his vocation, but only this much was vouchsafed to him, that his retreat director, to whom he unfolded the tale of his secret trouble, remained silent and recollected for a moment, and then said:

"God has formed a design of which you are to be the principal instrument. He is preparing all that is necessary for the fulfilment of His intentions. When all is ready, He will present the work to the workmen. Meanwhile, remain in peace."

So the time came with which we have begun our story; an invitation from a friend to "come with me to La Trappe;" a village fête, held before the Feast of the Assumption, to which, as though summoned by some unseen guidance, all his family came—father, mother, sisters, brothers, to the number of seventeen, and then a sudden storm delaying their departure, so that the farewell leave-takings grew to have a taste of more than ordinary solemnity, as, leaving his mother in his place to entertain some lingering guests, the young curé quitted his presbytery for a few days—as he believed—and drove off to join his friend upon the road to Aiguebelle.

The Order, or rather Reform, known to us under the name of La Trappe, takes its rise from that most illustrious of all learned orders, the Order and Rule of St. Benedict, and is more directly derived from those Cistercians whose name will ever be associated for us with their learned and gentle founder, St. Bernard. The Order of Citeaux was itself a reform; beginning with a little band of twenty-one religious, who, desiring greater austerity of life, quitted their monastery of Molesme and, plunging into the depths

of an almost impenetrable forest, near Dijon, essayed to live the life of the anchorites in earlier times, felling a few trees, and constructing therewith groups of rude huts to serve as dwelling places and chapel. They lived thus for some time without definite constitutions, following only in practice the Rule of St. Benedict, under the holy abbot, St. Robert, who had led them forth.

We learn that, at the beginning, the little community was sorely tried by sickness, calumny and persecution. Death so thinned their ranks that they seemed on the verge of extinction, while, to crown all, the Pope ordered St. Robert back to his former monastery of Molesmes, where his wise and prudent rule was much needed. Still the little community struggled on, and its second abbot, St. Alberic, gave them a constitution and a habit. Hitherto they had worn the black robe of the Benedictine, but now, out of love for Mary Immaculate, for whom he had a tender devotion, and even, as it is said, in consequence of a special revelation, St. Alberic clothed his monks in white, leaving only the black Benedictine scapular.

In 1109 an Englishman, St. Stephen Harding, became their third abbot, and with him began the true glory of their order; for one day as he knelt in prayer beneath the forest oaks, surrounded by his little band of monks, pale, emaciated, feeble of frame, yet, may we not guess, their faces lit with some supernatural radiance as they gathered courage and fervor from that spiritual communion with God which they had left all things to seek, as it were, in the desert, a little band of men, some thirty in number, were seen to approach. At their head walked a young man dressed in the rich garb of a noble of that period. Velvet and satin, gold chain and jewel, doubtless, were not wanting, nor waving plume, nor jewel-hilted sword; and St. Stephen watched them coming, with some strange inexplicable presentiment thrilling at his heart. He rose and welcomed the strangers; but they, falling at his feet, humbly prostrated themselves, and implored the favor of admission into this first Cistercian monastery. Their leader was no other than Bernard of Burgundy, afterwards the great St. Bernard.

He was one of seven children, six of whom were sons, and his mother, Alith, "not content to offer him to God as soon as he was born, as she did all her children, afterwards consecrated him to His service in the Church, as Hannah did Samuel, and from that day considered him as not belonging to her, but to God; and she took a special care of his education in hope that he would one day be worthy to serve at the altar." She was herself a woman of singular holiness; so much so that when she died the abbot of a neighboring monastery begged for her body and bore it away on

his own shoulders and those of his monks, to bury as "a most precious treasure."

From his earliest youth young Bernard's purity, recollectedness and fervor were marvellous, and he "made it his continual earnest prayer to God that He would never suffer him to sully his innocence by sin." So that when, at the age of twenty, he found himself his own master, his first impulse was to join the severe Cistercian order, already coming into renown as "a place where God was served with great fervor."

But he would not leave the world without drawing some with him to lead a life of perfection; and so eloquently did he plead his cause that first his uncle, a nobleman of great reputation as a swordsman; then Bartholomew and Andrew, his younger brothers; then Guy, the eldest, who was married and had two children (his wife consenting and becoming a nun herself); then Gerard, the second brother, "a captain of reputation and full of the world," besides many friends and kinsfolk, all accompanied Bernard to his retreat. We are told how, on the day appointed for their departure, Bernard and his brothers went to take their last farewell of their father and to beg his blessing, when, going out, they passed little Nivard, the youngest, at play with his companions, and Guy called out to him: "Adieu! my little brother Nivard; you will have all our estates and lands to yourself!" And the boy answered: "What! you then take heaven for your portion and leave me only earth? The division is too unequal!" They left him, but, not long after, he followed his brothers into the cloister; and their aged father afterwards sought the same refuge, received the habit from his saintly son, aud died happily at Clairvaux.

Fifty years afterwards the order had so multiplied that it numbered five hundred abbeys or monasteries. A hundred years after there were eighteen hundred. The Abbey of Aiguebelle, with which we have to do, was founded in 1137, and flourished down to the time of the great revolution, when, like all similar institutions, it was for a time left desolate. Meanwhile, among the many hundreds which, as we have said, rose in quick succession during and after the lifetime of St. Bernard, was one, founded by a certain Count Rotrou, in a lonely valley, well wooded and watered by many streams, and called Notre Dame de La Trappe. It was an ordinary Cistercian monastery like the rest, and, like the rest, became relaxed; so that when its famous abbot, de Rancé, underwent his world-renowed conversion, its reformation and reorganization rendered it in the eyes of the world almost a new order, giving its name to all the other houses which followed their reformed rule.

The conversion of the Abbé de Rancé is one of those striking

events about which a whole web of romance and fictitious matter has been woven, so as to entirely obscure the abundantly interesting and romantic facts of the case. As every one knows, the story ran, not among writers of the present day alone, but even among those who were his contemporaries, that he was a young and worldly priest, who, given up to libertinage and vice, received a sudden shock, leading to his conversion, owing to his entering, after a short absence, the apartment of his mistress, the beautiful Duchesse de M——, finding not only her dead body, but her ghastly decapitated corpse, which the undertakers had thus mutilated to fit into too short a coffin. Some writers go on to hint pretty plainly that de Rancé's mind became somewhat unhinged, and that the Reform of La Trappe was the result of a morbid and gloomy, if not altogether diseased, imagination. Nothing could be farther from the truth. De Rancé was indeed one of those, unhappily too numerous, ecclesiastics who, forced by his father and family reasons to receive the tonsure at an early age (he was tonsured and a canon and prebendary of Notre Dame de Paris, and in the receipt of rich revenues as abbot-commendatory, or titular abbot of four monasteries of different orders, among which was La Trappe, *at the age of eleven years*), led a worldly and self-indulgent life up to the time of middle age; but it is, to say the least, doubtful whether the Duchesse de Monthagon, the mother of his playmates, and ten years older than himself, was even more than a congenial friend, in whose home he found a second home circle, and of whose reputation he was careful enough, even to refuse to drive in the same carriage with her. During her last illness he was at her bedside, exhorting her to prepare for death, and procuring for her the last sacraments, and was only by chance absent at the moment of her death, having left the house to take a little repose.

The Duchesse de Monthagon died in 1657, and for six years afterwards a gradual transformation was taking place in the life of M. de Rancé, until at length, recognizing the divine call, he resolved to live in and reform one of the four monasteries of which he was already titular abbot, and chose that of La Trappe. Those who are conversant with the history of that period will readily understand how, though abbot-commendatory of La Trappe since his childhood, he had never before exercised any influence or authority in the place, or even set foot in it, and his first visit brought so violent a storm of resistance about him that his life was actually in danger, and he was forced, after taking the habit in another house, to pension off the more rebellious of the monks, and bring in a new body of men from one of the stricter Cistercian monasteries. Gradually, but perseveringly, did he and his new brethren shape

their lives in accord with the old traditions of ascetic severity which came from early Benedictine times. Rigorous fast, painful penance, strictest obedience and abundant prayer soon made La Trappe a model and a household word in the land. Travellers came, saw, were welcomed with antique hospitality, and departed to spread the tale; beggars swarmed thither to share and marvel at the coarse food and harsher discipline of men whom they had known to "fare sumptuously every day;" sinners and worldlings, touched by grace, went to La Trappe to learn how to amend their lives, or, special note of the Trappist Order, "to learn how to die." So, gradually only, the Cistercian brethren at Notre Dame de la Trappe became the Trappist monks.

At the Revolution of '98, when monasteries were dismantled and their inmates fled, the Trappists, like all other orders, were banished from their native land, and, led by their intrepid novice-master, Dom Augustin de Lestrange, a very remarkable man, almost a second de Rancé, they took refuge in Switzerland, where they founded a now celebrated house, that of Val Sainte, near Fribourg. At the Restoration they returned, bought and took possession of four of the ancient Cistercian abbeys, those of La Trappe, Aiguebelle, Bellefontaine and Melleray, which thus became the mother-houses of the modern order.

In the year 1834 a Papal decree united all the various "reformed" Cistercian monasteries under one head, and gave them the Abbot of La Grande Trappe as vicar-general; but as, since de Rancé's time, a second reform was carried out in some of the Cistercian houses under the name of the "new reform," while de Rancé's rule was termed the old, or first reform, this sole headship was found inadvisable, and a further ruling from Rome in 1847 gave each branch liberty and separate existence. The Trappists, however, in course of time, felt that the slight differences which divided them were scarcely such as to justify such subdivision, and the subject of our memoir, Pere Regis, did much, during his life in Rome, to promote the cause of unity. Finally, not long ago (in 1893), the Trappist order has again been united under one head, in the person of Dom Sebastian Wyart, a former Pontifical zouave and distinguished soldier and patriot, now vicar-general of the Reformed Cistercians in all their branches.

The stranger who visits any Trappist monastery at the present day may easily fancy himself transported to the times of St. Bernard, or even, perhaps, to those of St. Benedict; for there, more than in most monasteries under other rules, the ancient order and observances are still followed out in minutest detail. St. Benedict tells his monks to "omnes supervenientes hospites tanquam Christus suscipiantur" (receive all guests as though they were

Christ Himself); and lo! as the massive door opens to admit the visitor he is received by the porter on his knees, while two of the brethren prostrate themselves before *Christ in the person of the wayfarer*. Again, "vere monachi sunt si labore manuum suarum vivunt sicut patres nostri et apostoli" (they are true monks if they live by the work of their hands like the apostles); and forth come a train of brethren at sound of bell, robe tucked up and hood well over head, so that no vestige of the face can be recognized, to go their divers ways, one group to the fields, another to the farm, another to dig the ground, or hew wood, or wield the blacksmith's hammer; and all these avocations under the seal of that marvellous perpetual silence, which was, as it were, the keynote of de Rancé's Reform. Strange stories, indeed, are told of that silence in de Rancé's own time; how a basket-maker, having been employed to teach the brethren his trade, lived for three months among them without even being able to induce them to utter a single word. More than that, two masons, whose sons were among the lay-brethren, were permitted to work side by side with their sons for fifteen days, under the same strict observance of silence; and they afterwards related how edifyingly their sons had behaved, casting happy glances to heaven at the pious sentiments uttered by the two fathers during their conversations together, but showing by grave and displeased looks their disapproval of any lighter talk. Many a wayfarer, thus received and entertained in solemn silence, was so attracted thereby as to solicit admission into the order; and the voluntary submission of the brethren to what seems, in the eyes of the world, merely a hardship, was often carried by them to the extent of confessing, as a fault, the utterance of some involuntary cry in the presence of grave danger; as when a lay-brother, attacked and tossed by a bull, permitted himself to cry aloud for help, but accused himself afterwards, in Chapter, of grave infringement of the rule; while others were known to have incurred imminent danger of death rather than utter a word.

As in St. Bernard's time, too, the monks sleep little, and their couch is hard. A couple of planks or a truss of straw covered with sackcloth forms the material of rows of beds in a common dormitory, where, always habited and even shod, some of earth's noblest sons snatch brief repose, rising at midnight for a four hours' office of watch and prayer. For two-thirds of the entire year the Trappist monk fasts daily; his one repast at half-past two in winter, or four o'clock in Lent; and indeed his meagre repast of vegetables or fruits can scarce be called at any time a meal. "The life of a monk should be a perpetual Lent," so runs their rule; and though a little milk, or vegetables prepared with milk,

is allowed on feast days, the usual fare is meagre in the extreme. For the benefit of the curious on this head, we will transcribe more exactly de Rancé's own rule:

"Nothing shall be served in the refectory save vegetables, roots, herbs or milk food; never any fish, meat, eggs, pastry or anything approaching them, even cream. By vegetables we mean lentils, peas, beans and haricots. By roots, carrots, beetroots, turnips, oyster-plant, citronilles (gourds) and artichokes. By milk food we mean soups, preparations of wheat, barley, rice or Indian corn. By herbs, lettuce, sorrel, spinach, and cabbage. No flavoring is to be added to improve them, nor any spice properly so called, but only scallion, onion and tarragon, and great moderation in these. Butter is never to be used; it may be replaced by a few drops of milk, which are to be omitted during Lent and Advent, all fasting days and Fridays (except withinPaschaltide), when vegetables and roots are to be cooked in salt and water only."

Like the early Benedictines and Cistercians, the Trappists' invariable allowance was "two portions of cooked food," *due pulmenta cocta* at the principal, or on fast days only, meal, "so that," as St. Benedict explained, "he who could not eat of one dish might eat the other"; together with an allowance of one pound of bread per day; and though the food in question would not seem to our more pampered tastes to offer any great variety, St. Bernard thus indignantly apostrophizes some of his brethren who appear to have complained of their vegetarian diet: "Can one find nothing in garden or field to suit your stomachs?" while de Rancé quoted an ancient Cistercian abbot to the effect that "we have three grains of pepper wherewith to season our coarse food; the first grain is to rise long before daybreak, the second to work with our hands, the third to have nothing better to eat. For which reason we have hardly anything on our platters." This, though an eye-witness tells us that the bread at La Trappe was so black and even full of straw that it seemed only fit for dogs, and their portions of cooked vegetables were so watery and tasteless that they were sometimes even refused by the poor of the place.

And now we may return to our modern novice, the young Abbé de Martrin. After a few days' probation, Léon de Martrin, with another priest-postulant, was conducted to the feet of the abbot, in accordance with ancient Cistercian rite, to ask for "the mercy of God, and thine." The abbot then expounded to him the severity of the rule, and inquired his intention again, to which he repeated his desire to keep it all. The abbot then said: "May God, who hath begun a good work in thee, Himself accomplish it." His luxuriant locks were shorn, his cassock exchanged for the white robe of the Trappist, and Léon de Martrin-Donos became Brother Francis Régis, taking the name of a saintly apostle who had been one of his own most glorious family ancestors. After the ceremony he was permitted to take leave of his sorrowing fellow-

traveller, whom he charged to break the news to his family, together with a letter, and a paper distributing his possessions among them; and then the Curé of Albi wended his solitary way homeward, quoting sadly, as he took his leave, the words of Holy Scripture: "One shall be taken, the other left."

We need not dwell upon the surprise and grief of parents and sisters as the coach drew up bringing "Léon's portmanteau, but no Léon," and death itself was feared in that first moment of uncertainty, until they learned that it was the living death of the cloister; but we must give in full the touching letter addressed to him by his bishop, showing, as it does, in what esteem he was held.

"*Monsieur et Cher Curé:—*

"It is with lively sorrow that I find you taking up your abode at La Trappe, because I lose in you a priest according to the mind of God, full of prudence and zeal, and capable of directing important parishes in the ways of God. You might have sanctified yourself elsewhere, and at the same time sanctified, with yourself, a multitude of souls which the Divine Providence would have confided to you, and which you would have been able to present to the Father, on the great Day of Revealing, as your title to a brilliant crown.

"In your present retreat you will be directly useful only to yourself, indirectly to others by your prayers. God forbid, however, that I should attempt to turn you from your pious purpose. You believe that God has called you to solitude; you choose the surest path; follow your vocation; I consent. Correspond with the designs of Providence for you. Only, if during your novitiate you recognize that God asks something else of you; if the great austerity of La Trappe affects your health; if complete solitude does not suit you; in a word, if you find you ought to leave the monastery, do not hesitate to take refuge in the arms of an archbishop who will receive you as a father would receive his son, and who would be delighted to see you and employ you again. You know my paternal affection for you. You deserve it, since up to to-day you have never given me anything but satisfaction. It will follow you in your monastery, and will end but with my life."

If such was the grief of his spiritual father, what must have been that of his earthly one? M. de Martrin-Donos at first refused even to answer the long and affectionate letters which Léon dispatched one after another to his parents; then, finding this course ineffectual, he went in person to La Trappe to pour out his reproaches and rebukes. "Father," cried the young novice, falling on his knees before the angry old man, "if you believe your son ungrateful, scourge him; here is my discipline!" The friend who accompanied M. de Martrin-Donos threatened to take the fugitive back by force; the archbishop offered the inducement of advantageous posts; his father, joined by the other sons, proffered "a double portion" of their inheritance, did but their holy prodigal return, but all in vain; Brother Francis Régis made his profession on the thirtieth of August, in the following year, 1842.

On the day of his profession he wrote to his mother a letter

which is very touching in its singularity and faith. "I do not know," he says, "whether God has been content with me, but for my part I am very content with Him. Before entering religion I thought I had a good chance of working out my salvation, but I was far from suspecting all the consolations which life at La Trappe procures for one; in truth I am unworthy of all the sweetness which God deigns to pour upon His unworthy servant."

One cannot help recalling, as one reads these words, the dying utterance of another holy servant of God, Suarez, the Jesuit: "I never thought it was so sweet to die!"

Almost immediately after his profession Dom Francis Régis was appointed Master of Novices, and won golden opinions by his tact and sweetness, his delicate thoughtfulness for the neophytes under his charge, some of whom were no longer young and found their new life of subjection and obedience somewhat hard in practice; and, in fine, showed such universal qualities and capacities for command that, while still quite a young religious, he was chosen to fill the very honorable and difficult post which makes him the subject of these pages.

Not long after the profession of Dom Francis Régis, a proposition was made to the Superior of the Trappist Order, much resembling the recent one with which we began these pages. It was a request that the Trappist Fathers, whose work and whose energy were well known, would aid in the colonization of Algeria, then a newly-conquered country, by establishing there a branch of their order. After some delay, owing to the unreliable nature of the terms offered by government, a satisfactory arrangement was arrived at, and Dom Francis Régis was sent out, as first superior, with one of his brethren, to prepare the way for the new foundation.

On Saturday, the 12th of August, 1843, after a sea voyage of fifty-two hours, the two Trappist Fathers set foot in Algiers. It was not then the fashionable and civilized resort which it has since become, and being but newly conquered, or in fact half-conquered, was subject to frequent armed raids from the Arab foes, whose chief, the Emir Abd-el-Kader, threatened that "as long as a breath of life remains to me I will make war against the Christians." Our two Fathers, then, on landing, were hospitably received by a friend of one of their order, and the next day, after paying their respects to the bishop, they presented themselves before the military governor of the district, General Bougeaud. He was a straightforward and able man, and had already assured the Trappists' introducer, M. de Corcelle, of his good-will and protection, though his own cherished scheme for the colonization of the country had been for civil rather than religious occupation. He re-

ceived his white-robed visitors somewhat brusquely, though civilly, with the words: "So you are the Trappists! You know it was not my opinion! We don't want celibates for colonizing Algeria; but I am a soldier; you bring me letters from the Minister of War, who is my chief; I obey! I accept you as children of our new colonial family. But, gentlemen, you will work no more miracles than others can. I warn you that you will meet with great difficulties. When they appear to you to be insurmountable, apply to me. When will you begin?"

"The sooner the better," replied Père Régis.

"Well, I am going to convoke my council; when they are assembled I will summon you."

Some hours later the two white-robed monks entered the council chamber and found about twelve or fifteen of the general's staff, in full uniform, awaiting them. General Bougeaud, having briefly explained to his coadjutors the scheme of the projected establishment, which, he said, would prove a most useful one, proceeded to the practical part of the affair.

"You, Monsieur l'Intendant, will give them tents to live in; you will organize a service of mules and relays for their benefit, with rations and all arrangements as if for military service. You, M. le Directeur of engineers, will set up their workshops and procure tools for them at army prices. You, M. le Directeur of the fort, will choose out for them sixty convict workmen."

Then, taking up a pen, he wrote out a list of the number of blacksmiths, carpenters, carters, masons, etc., who were to be placed under the orders of the colonists of Staouëli, a spot in the desert where a grant of land 1020 hectares in extent (2500 English acres) had already been allotted to them, together with a year's provisions and 60,000 francs for building-money. Then he added, turning towards the Fathers: "You say that you wish to begin as soon as possible. It would be desirable that you should do so before the winter rains begin, so fix the day."

"The 20th is the feast of our holy father St. Bernard; we should like to pitch our tents on that day."

"Very well! On the 21st our men and material will start for Staouëli. Be there to receive them."

That same afternoon, the eve of the Assumption, Père Régis drove out in the bishop's carriage to visit the scene of his future labors. Staouëli, their allotted land, is described as presenting the appearance of a vast plain, almost a desert, sloping gently towards the Mediterranean, which bounds it on one side, and covered with rough bushes and tangled undergrowth. Here and there a group of dwarf palms broke the dead level of what seemed all one stretch of arid waste, where jackals and other wild animals

roamed at will. It was not without its memories, however, this wild plain; some remains of fortifications, and broken shells scattered here and there, recalled to the visitors that fierce battle of fourteen years before on this very spot, where five thousand Arabs on the one side and five hundred Frenchmen on the other perished upon the battle-field of Sidi-Ferruch. Père Régis, who had pictured to himself some smiling country, bright with orange trees and rose-gardens, felt his heart sink for a moment at the dreary reality before him; but quickly recovering himself, he hailed the sight of two small streams as giving promise of water for their agricultural requirements; and gathering a branch of "laurier-rose" (oleander) to send "home" to Aiguebelle, he planted, under a palm tree, the rude wooden cross which he had brought with him as their token of possession. It was already almost a holy spot, for here, after the battle referred to above, the chaplains who accompanied the army had offered a Mass of Thanksgiving.

"It was there," writes Père Régis to his former superior at Aiguebelle, "that I planted my humble cross. We all fell on our knees to salute it. The sun was setting behind us, beyond Sidi-Ferruch and the sea, and just before us the moon showed herself above the horizon. To the left, the sea. To the right, far off, a group of farm buildings. Everywhere one profound silence, and we, recollected and silent also, in this majestic temple of nature. I cannot express to you the thoughts which filled my heart. Before rising I repeated aloud the Pater, Ave, and Credo, with the others, and ended by placing ourselves and our future under the protection of the Queen of Heaven."

The following days were spent in various preparations, and on the afternoon of the 20th, after a morning spent in office and prayer in honor of the great St. Bernard, the little company set forth to take possession of their new property. It will not be forgotten, that it was on this same day only two years before, that the young Abbé de Martrin had set foot for the first time in La Trappe. And now, a professed religious, he was beginning anew in the responsible position of superior of a new foundation. And such a foundation! Colonist, missionary, builder, monk, he may well have marvelled at the development of so choice a vocation, and many and deep must have been the thoughts which filled his brain as the little band of pilgrims, on foot this time, trod slowly the sandy waste towards the sea. Besides Père Régis, there were some eight or ten secular and religious priests (not counting his fellow-Trappist, who was in delicate health and would follow later with the workmen), the Superior of the Jesuits, and three Jesuit lay-brothers, whom their superior's forethought had added

to the party for the purpose of carrying and cooking their provisions.

Absorbed with pious talk and the memories of the past, the little company suddenly discovered that they had missed their way and were lost in the desert! Père Régis naïvely confessed that he could not find his "big palm tree" which was to have been their landmark, and the whole party were forced to camp for the night where they stood; surrounded by howling jackals, and not daring to light a fire or discharge a gun, lest the Arabs should discover and attack them. When day broke, they continued their route, discovered their palm tree and cross, and taking possession of a dilapidated hut or sentry box left by the soldiers in 1830, they made an improvised altar within it, cut down palm branches to serve as candlesticks, and there the founder of a new Trappist mission, after sprinkling the ground with holy water, said his first Mass.

"Oh, what a day!" he wrote to Dom Orsise. "In the midst of the desert we raised an altar. The blue vault of heaven was the dome of our cathedral, earth and sea its extent, an old, worn palm tree the table of the altar. From its branches, overhead, hung an image of Jesus; among its leaves two statues, those of Notre Dame d'Aiguebelle and of St. Francis Régis. They are our two founders. I said the Mass of the Holy Ghost, with memento of the Blessed Virgin and of St. Bernard. All were much moved, I myself more than the others. I felt as though I were saying my first Mass."

As the little party sat on the ground after Mass, enjoying a modest repast prepared by the lay-brothers, the military and convict workmen came in sight, and very soon all was work and bustle. Tents were pitched, plans drawn out, the ground surveyed, and future work prepared. Here the masons were constructing a lime-kiln, there some carpenters nailed rough planks together to serve as provisionary shelter for the monks. The tent of the new superior was marked by a bunch of flowers—a graceful act of the convict workmen, and when he had been called to give the first stroke of the pickaxe at the spot chosen for the monastic buildings, the work of levelling and digging went on apace, under the direction of a military engineer. At the end of the first week the wooden building which was to serve as temporary monastery was complete, and gave shelter to monks, convicts and overseers alike. There were a blacksmith's forge and a carpenter's shop, a stable full of bullocks for the plough, carts, tools and every other requisite for the work, while the disused tent which had sheltered their first altar still served as a temporary chapel.

Up to this time Père Régis had been a superior without brethren, a shepherd without sheep, as it were; for his sole companion in religion, Père Gabriel, seems to have been in ill-health and remained at first in more civilized quarters in the town; but on the

13th of September, to the great joy of the courageous pioneer, a welcome reinforcement arrived in the shape of ten Trappist brothers and two fathers, sent from the parent house at Aiguebelle, to form the nucleus of the new foundation. Next day, the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, an interesting ceremonial took place. The Bishop of Algiers, Mgr. Dupuch, in the presence of the governor and his staff, various notabilities of the place and a crowd of colonists and Arabs, sang a solemn Pontifical Mass, at an extemporary altar erected in the midst of the work, blazing with lights and garlanded gracefully with myrtle and oleander. Then, repairing in procession to the spot where the foundation-stone was to be laid, this brilliant little company witnessed a thick layer of cement being spread over the unique basement of a closely-packed layer of bullets picked up off the field of battle; after which a chiselled stone, which had once formed part of a Roman villa in ancient times on this very plain, was laid with the usual ceremonies, ending with a salvo of artillery, and followed by a modest collation, served in the new wooden building, whose walls were literally covered with flowers. About forty guests surrounded the rough wooden table, waited on by the white-robed brethren, and "some great dishes of cigars," which, for the lack of other delicacies, the good superior added to the dessert, were, he told his correspondent, much appreciated; while one of the newly-arrived brethren related how, in 1830, he had fought as a soldier on this same battle-field of Staouëli, and had actually helped to erect the "blochaus," or hut, now temporary chapel, in which he had received Holy Communion that very morning from the hands of his new superior.

Their simple fête seems to have been productive of much indirect benefit to the good fathers, for, sad as it is to say it, officialism and public opinion in France were by no means uniformly favorable to their work. "Get yourselves talked of as colonists as much as possible, and as monks as little as possible," was the advice of one of their supporters, and wary indeed had to be their conduct under the watchful eyes of many a secret enemy, who criticized each movement, and even accused them of "spending the public money on their own buildings rather than on cultivating the land," as if the unhappy colonist-monks must needs be grudged even necessary shelter. They suffered enough as it was, for the winter rains came on before their building was far enough advanced to replace the temporary plant cabins, which let in wind and wet, and one after another fell ill until more than half their number had been removed, for better air and nursing, to the Jesuits' house some miles off. Few ever guessed what courage, as well as administrative talent, it needed for Père Règis to fulfil

his double work; on the one hand hastening the building on which the health, nay, the very lives of those committed to his charge, depended, and on the other, forced, through the suspicions and hostilities of the civil power, to begin too soon the outdoor labors which were to justify their presence there.

On the twenty-fifth of March following, eighteen more brethren arrived from Aiguebelle, and some days later a government inquiry into the progress of the religious colonists elicited the information that two wings of the building were about to be roofed in, two more were in course of construction, and, for the land, 60 hectares had been cleared, 20 converted into fields, and 2500 trees planted on the property. The inhabitants of the little colony now numbered some forty-three monks, twenty lay-helpers and about a hundred government workmen. So far, the result was satisfactory, but the very calculation and examination elicited by this inquiry revealed to Père Régis the alarming fact that not only the original government subsidy, but all the money so generously given by the Aiguebelle brethren, was exhausted, and in a few days more he would have no more funds even to pay his workmen. After strenuous exertions and endless appeals, a further sum was voted by the colonial Council of Administration, but, unfortunately, the authorities in the French Chamber refused at first to ratify their vote, and the poor Trappists were reduced to the greatest straits. To add to their misfortunes, the hot season now set in, and their first experience of an Algerian summer was a terrible one. First, about two-thirds of their harvests perished, dried up and burnt, and the little that remained turned out almost worthless; then the heat struck down one after another, and day by day the convict workmen were carried off to the town hospital, while the unhappy monks, who had no such refuge, shivered and burned with agues and exhausting fevers, the "dengue fever" of marshy plains, to which such pioneers of civilization are ever subject. It was a terrible time. The brave superior, himself weakened both by fever and by the violent bleedings with which they sought to combat it, till he could scarcely hold a pen, sat writing, in the intervals o ague, pathetic appeals for help to their European brethren; while one after another his pale, shivering, emaciated monks would creep to his side to implore help or gather a word of encouragement. Some, gasping under the almost unendurable suffocation of that hot air and brazen sky, broke down completely, and begged to be sent back to France; others lay helpless and broken in spirit upon the wooden couches, the sweat of utter weakness pouring from their brows.

At length Père Régis felt that there was but one thing to be done—to return to Europe and make a personal appeal for help

both to government and to the other houses of the order. His unhappy and suffering brethren parted reluctantly from him, and, weakened by fever as he was himself, he set sail for Europe on the 30th July, 1844.

Once more in his native land, he left no stone unturned to procure material help for the new foundation. From Soulthery, where the minister of war was interviewed, he passed on to Paris, not, however, without giving his family the consolation of a short visit, during which an interesting little episode may serve to show how Staouëli became peopled. Brother Casimir, the monastery baker, had come from a town near his superior's old home, and Dom Régis, mindful of this fact, went, during his short stay in the neighborhood, to visit the parents of his brother in religion. There, sitting in the peasant's kitchen, and surrounded by parents and relations of the absent one, he told them, in his own bright and kindly fashion, of Brother Casimir and his bakery, and all the little details of his every-day life. Then, as the good folk shed some natural tears, "How is this?" cried the father. "I thought to give you pleasure by telling you about your son, but I fear it only makes you unhappy!" "Oh, no, indeed, father," was the answer; "our tears are only tears of joy; and to show you that it is so, we have another son, a boy of fourteen, still at home; if you wish, you may take him too!" The boy was hiding in a corner of the room, bashful, as peasant boys mostly are. Dom Régis looked across to him with his kind, sweet smile, and, holding out his hand, called, with the affectionate *tutoiement* for which we have no equivalent, "Veux tu venir avec moi? Nous irons rejoindre ton frere." "Yes, I will!" cried the boy, suddenly jumping into the good monk's arms. And he went back with him to Algeria.

From Paris Dom François went on to La Grande Trappe, where he hoped to enlist the sympathies of a meeting of superiors about to be held there, which he did, and received encouraging promises of recruits and funds to accompany him to Algiers. Thence he passed to Melleray, where he was received with open arms and urged to rest awhile amid his brethren there. But ill news followed him thither; one death after another had taken place since his departure from Algeria; dysentery, that scourge of southern climates, had set in among the monks, and no less than five had succumbed to its attacks. Needless to say that their superior's paternal care was doubly yearned for at this season of trial, and in face of the pleading letters which came he could not find it in his heart to delay his return. The good Abbot of Melleray gave him six of his best subjects, and sent him forth with them in ceremonious procession, the brethren accompanying them

as far as the limits of their property and bidding them farewell with the kiss of peace, "with the same ceremonies with which St. Bernard, eight centuries before, had quitted Citeaux for the desert of Clairvaux."

Passing by Nantes, Angers, Tours, Orleans and Lyons, where they gathered offerings and gifts as they went, they halted again at the mother-house, Aiguebelle, and taking thence two more recruits and a further sum of money, the little company re-embarked for Africa. It was a sad and suffering community which welcomed them back. One young priest who lay dying could only murmur: "Father, I have prayed to live till you returned, that I might receive your blessing," and the next morning he too had gone to his rest. Three more, stricken unto death, were sent back to Aiguebelle, and died there, while the new-comers set to work courageously at building and planting, as long as their funds should last.

Space would fail us were we to enlarge further on the difficulties, the trials, the sorrows of that fateful time. Suffice it to say that at length the work was so far advanced that the bishop was able, in the presence of a brilliant assembly of the principal notables of Algiers, to consecrate the monastery chapel. Not the least of his silently-borne crosses must have been the trial that our brave superior, who had been the life and soul of the work, was now himself laid prostrate, and the consecration day found him on a sick bed, tossing in high fever. Summoned, not long after, to join a general chapter of superiors in France, he obeyed the call, and once more set sail for Europe, arriving in so prostrate a condition that while going by sea from Bordeaux to Nantes he heard his fellow-passengers whispering among themselves, "That monk will die on the way," and he was obliged to seek a resting-place with some friends at Nantes before continuing his journey. "I want to die at Melleray," he said, and had himself conveyed there to the care of the abbot, who "loved him like a father." But he did not die this time, and profiting by a slight amendment in his health, he returned once more to his post, where the works were now far enough advanced to justify the raising of the monastery to the position and title of an independent abbey.

Although Dom Francis, in his humility, now sought to retire from office and to make way for a new abbot, it will readily be understood that his name, and no other, left the election urn. He was forced to yield to the votes of his brethren, and his promotion involved a new visit to Europe to obtain formal ratification of his election from the abbots of the older houses. He found them assembled in Rome on important business, no other than the question of sub-division or unity already referred to in these pages. For, as we have before explained, the Trappists were divided into

two branches: one following the reform of De Rancé, the other living under the original rule of Citeaux, and called the "new reform." By a decree of Pope Gregory XVI., in 1834, these two branches had been so far united as to be placed under one head, while still respectively preserving certain differences of discipline and practice; but this arrangement was found burdensome to tender consciences, and thus practically undesirable, so that they now petitioned to be independent as before. Eventually, by a Papal decree in 1847, their request was granted, and while de Rancé's original reform claimed four principal monasteries, as well as that of "Sept Fonts," which held the position of mother-house and sent forth various offshoots with which we have not now to do, the stricter, or new reform, counted as its own not only the original Grand Trappe, but Melleray, Bellefontaine, Aiguebelle, and its offshoot Staouëli, and several others, of which those that probably interest us the most are those at the "Tre Fontane" in the Roman Campagna, Mount St. Bernard in England, Mount Melleray in Ireland and Notre Dame de Gethsemani in the United States.

After a consoling interview with the Supreme Pontiff, and many expressions of appreciation from friends and superiors, Dom Régis returned for his consecration to his African home, and received his abbatial crosier in all due form on the 28th of December, 1846. The Staouëli foundation was now complete, though still subject, in some measure, to the parent stem, Aiguebelle, and henceforward, though not exempt from trials and dangers, its existence and work were assured. In 1849 its lands, which had hitherto been held, as it were, temporally and revocably from the local administration, were secured to it in perpetuity, and new buildings, new subjects, new or extended spheres of action gathered round it year by year.

One of the trials of the little colonist community lay in the frequent changes of governors-general of Algeria, which political events in the mother country unfortunately necessitated. The young Duc d'Aumale, in 1847, proved an even stauncher and more gracious protector to the "Christian marabouts," as they were called by the population, than his predecessor; but the revolution of '48 recalled him to France, and governor after governor in rapid succession was called upon, while administering the affairs of the colony, to look favorably upon "the worthiest of their subjects," as one and all agreed to call them. The marvellous gift of administration exhibited by Dom Régis in particular, and the prosperity of his monastery, called forth frequent expressions of admiring surprise from the officials who visited it from time to time. One of these government inspectors thus describes his visit:

"I wish I could more worthily describe this worthy and saintly abbot. His zeal and energy remind me of the great reformer of his order, and the work which he is engaged in is hardly inferior to that of de Rancé. He is like him, too, in another point, which is his facility for dealing with the world and worldly matters, and making his appearance wherever the interests of his community call him. Constantly on horseback, booted and spurred, Père Régis rides with all the ease of practiced horsemanship, and thinks nothing of riding from Staouëli to Algiers and back in the same day. Or, one may see him out in the fields at work in his rough sackcloth working habit, and with his bright, ruddy, sunburnt face, ever smiling, ever alert, *with one eye on souls, the other on his fields*, and here, there, everywhere at once. One moment on the plains of Algeria, the next at Marseilles, or Paris or Rome, flying at express speed wherever duty calls him. . . . . He did the honors for us with exquisite grace, and an almost indescribable frank cordiality. I must confess that I had imagined a Trappist superior a much more sombre individual."

Nothing could have been more favorable to the interests of the growing community than this pleasant, courteous, fascinating abbot, for the new monastery had not only to attend to its own spiritual affairs and to its fields, agriculture and farm operations, but had also a distinct social work to perform. Hardly any visitor of importance—governor, prince, distinguished traveler, or official representative—landed in Algeria, but he must go, or be taken, to visit the Trappist settlement. Did any question arise as to the kind or amount of culture to which that long tract of land between French buildings and Arab possessions might be successfully submitted, the Trappist monastery was quoted, examined and held up as an example for lay colonists.

One of the most interesting episodes in Dom Francis Régis's African life, is his friendship for, and conversion of, the famous painter, Horace Vernet. Visiting the Staouëli Monastery, like so many others, from curiosity, he fell under the charm of its winning founder, confessed, made a retreat, fulfilled his Easter duties and thus initiated a bond between them which was to be loosed only by the hand of death; for his affection for the white-robed father seems almost more than ordinary friendship, the clinging of an artistic and sensitive temperament to its master and guide. While Vernet was in Algeria, an expedition was planned into Kabylia for the purpose of punishing some native tribes who had refused to pay tribute to their conquerors, and the general in command begged Horace Vernet to accompany them. "I will go," said the painter, "but I must have *my Père Régis* with me!" Seeing him to be in earnest, the governor-general sent off a special messenger with a pressing letter to the abbot, inviting him to join the expeditionary corps, and assuring him, on the one hand, of all the respect and appreciation which would be paid him amongst them; while on the other, he dwelt on the immense field for good which would be open to him among the soldiers in camp and on the battle-field. It seemed a strange step to take, and Dom Régis,

hesitating much, consulted first his monks and then his bishop, on the advisability of accepting such a proposal. "Go!" said they all, and the bishop added: "It is very seemly that religion should accompany the flag of France." So he went.

During all their march—and it lasted several weeks—Dom Régis and Horace Vernet rode side by side. They ate together, the same tent sheltered both, and when at length the summoned tribes brought tribute and hostages and owned themselves subject to France, the governor, after receiving their oath of fidelity, returned their money-presents, bestowed new dignities on the now submissive Sheiks, and, turning to Dom Régis, said: "Now you shall have the honor of finishing this ceremony." The "finish" was—an altar raised in the desert. And such an altar! One feels that it was erected under the hand and eye of an artist. One great oak, levelled by the sappers attached to the expeditionary corps, was fashioned into a huge rustic cross, which towered high in air; beneath it, row upon row, a pile of drums formed an unique platform for the portable altar raised upon them, which, garlanded with some of the rare desert flowers gathered near the spot, was still further decked with a contribution from a steamer, which lay at anchor near, two enormous ship lanterns, supplementing the usual and necessary liturgical wax candles on either side. As the commanding figure of the Trappist monk, robed in his abbatial insignia and vestments, stood before the altar, the painter's eye swept over a strange and picturesque sight. The whole army corps, ranged in a semi-circle, stood in serried ranks, their general and his staff in the midst; outside this circle a throng of white-robed Arabs, wondering and watchful; away in the distance a long stretch of desert on the one side; on the other the blue Mediterranean sparkled beneath the sun. He was so struck with the scene that he has immortalized it in one of his most famous pictures, entitled "Une Messe en Kabylie," in which, as he said himself, he offered to God "the expression of his gratitude for having been brought back to Him." The time chosen by the painter is the moment of the elevation. Dom Régis himself, served by a Trappist brother and a secular priest, stands full in view before the temporary altar, on a platform supported by piles of drums, and surmounted by the gigantic cross. To the left kneel row upon row of *Chasseurs d'Afrique*, in their picturesque zouave jackets and full trousers; while graceful Arab figures, in turban and ample white *bournous*, fill the foreground; and far away in middle distance the white tents of the soldiers stand out against a background of tall mountain; while the cannon smoke, which marks the moment of adoration—"sole incense worthy of such a sacrifice"—hangs over all.

Curiously enough, the general in command on this occasion was a Protestant, and though he admired and reverenced the good Trappist abbot, he only abjured his errors some time later, under the guidance of the celebrated Père Olivaint; but, before that event, he had already marked his appreciation of the "desert Mass" by soliciting and obtaining from the emperor the Cross of the Legion of Honor for Dom Régis, in memory of the bloodless campaign in which he had shared. Meanwhile, the two friends, monk and painter, had returned together to Algiers. Vernet set sail at once for Europe, and had the happiness, some time later, of officiating as "godfather" to his beloved Père Régis, when the latter, on one of his visits to France, received "the Cross," bestowed, with all due ceremony, in token of his own, or, as he preferred to take it, his monastery's services to the state. The official pages, "Le Moniteur Universal" (of August 16, 1853), thus announced the considerations which motived the distinction:

"De Martrin-Donos, in religion Francis Régis, priest, director of La Trappe at Staouëli, has powerfully contributed, since 1843, to the development of the Algerian Colony by the foundation of an agricultural establishmeut which is justly considered to be a model one;"

and the "Univers," more appreciatively, wrote of the distant monastery on Algerian plains as one which "the whole world admires, while travellers and the poor bless it."

And now the foundation of Staouëli may be said to be complete; for the monastery—though not the stately church dreamed of by its founder, for which sufficient funds were still lacking—was built, inhabited, and self-supporting. One might naturally imagine that after ten years of labor, and slow, even painful acclimatization, one who had never spared himself and whose genius had made the place what it was, might in some degree reap the fruit of his labors; but it was not to be. Having learned by bitter experience not to run headlong into expense, or begin a work which he held no certainty of carrying through, Dom Régis, with the prudence learned by many a failure, had omitted as yet to erect full and sufficient barriers between the monastic part of the building and that open to workmen and soldiers. It was the next work which he proposed to himself to undertake; but, as so often happens in life, ere his plans could be carried out, one of the periodical visitations from the mother-house at Aiguebelle took place. The defect was noticed, and perhaps a little—one can scarcely say blamed, but—taken exception to; and Dom Régis was invited by the General Chapter to repair for rest and retreat to Aiguebelle, leaving a temporary substitute (the Prior of La Grand Trappe), in authority in his place. He obeyed, and started at once, followed

by an urgent appeal from his monks, who were in consternation at his loss, to return among them; he, however, bravely and humbly upheld the decision of his superiors, and applied himself to second in every way, by counsel, information and influence, his successor in command. And the situation needed all his frank support; for many who had befriended Staouëli for his sake, now threatened to withdraw their influence and to "visit it no more, now that its abbot was *banished*," as they worded it. Dom Régis, on his side, spared no pains to induce the benefactors of his Algerian foundation to continue their support, while his firm friend, the Abbot of Aiguebelle, wrote in all directions to contradict unfavorable reports, and then, the more effectually to discountenance them, sent him on a confidential mission to Rome, to treat of the affairs of the order.

And here, did we treat exclusively of the Trappists in Algeria, our story would close; for never again, save for one brief passing visit, did Dom François Régis behold his beloved Staouëli. "I have planted, Apollos watered," is, and must ever be, the device of many a religious founder; and the fair cloisters and cool fountains of La Trappe in Algeria have been an oasis wherein many have found rest in life and peace in death, but never he whose strong brain and ready hand first made that "desert to blossom like the rose."

Not, however, that his life of active usefulness was at an end. Possessing, as he did, in largest measure, that marvellous gift of sympathy which made them say of him, as was said of St. Francis de Sales, that he was "all things to all men" ("Avec les Bédouins je me fais Bédouin," he said himself, in his Algerian days), it is small wonder that his superiors should soon have named him for a post in which tact, and gracious ways, and ready speech, and "the courage of his opinions," had full play, and were valued at their true worth. He was made Procureur-General of the Congregation of La Trappe, an office which obliged him to reside in Rome to represent, and transact the affairs of, the order; and this post, an honor in itself, and yet to him personally a trial, involved, of necessity, the resignation of his abbatial chair. He is said to have felt this so keenly that his hand shook and tears rained down his cheeks as he signed his formal resignation; but he presently threw himself heart and soul into his new work, induced one of the most learned of the cardinals to become Protector of the Order, and succeeded thoroughly in his mission—that of making the Trappists better known and appreciated at headquarters.

It had for some time been a great grief to the superiors of the various houses that their order was looked upon with little interest or favor at Rome. Besides some hampering restrictions which

threw difficulties in the way or their obtaining postulants, a decree of 1837 had even divested them of the permission to make solemn vows, a decision which was felt to be so grevious and even humiliating that it was some years before the heads of the principal houses could make up their minds to acquaint their subjects with Rome's ruling. Dom Régis set his heart on the revocation of this edict, and finally succeded, and was rewarded by being the first of all the Trappist Superiors to pronounce his own, and receive the others' solemn vows. Another of his successes, and one which we all know well, was suggested to him by the Holy Father himself. Questioning Père Régis, at his first interview with him as procureur, on Staouëli and its foundation, Pius IX. let fall a remark destined to bear rich fruit. "And why," he asked "should you not make a Staouëli in the Roman Campagna?" Père Régis accepted the idea with enthusiasm, and forthwith drew out and submitted plans to the Pontiff; but much to his disappointment, they were found too expensive to carry out at that time, though later on he was allowed to carry out a modified form of them, in the celebrated "The Fontane," which we all know, and which was, indeed, in may ways a second Staouëli.

Once, and once only, during his procuratorship and later years, Dom Régis was allowed to visit Staouëli, the child of his love and of his prayers, "l'enfant de sa douleur," as he called it, but surely also the child of his truest joys. The Abbot of Aiguebelle, Dom Gabriel, knowing his friend's love for this, his "first-born" work, sent him in his stead to make the regulation visit to their Algerian affiliation. It was in 1860.

On his arrival in Algeria, Dom Augustine, the Abbot of Staouëli, met and welcomed him cordially, and conducted him, with all the state doubly due to Father Visitor and venerated Founder, to visit his early religious home. Nothing was spared which could enhance the dignity and brilliancy of the occasion. As Dom Regis approached the monastery (the abbot having gone on before to receive him ceremoniously) its bells rang out a joyous peal; garlands of flowers and greens, recalling his first day there, decked the long avenue; banners floated proudly overhead, and two long lines of white-robed brethren in festal garb awaited his approach. The venerated founder was conducted with all due ceremony to a raised däis, under a triumphal arch, where, having been solemnly and affectionately welcomed by the abbot, he was invested with the insignia of his office, and the whole community went in procession to the church; whence, after receiving the blessing of their visitor, the fathers proceeded to the Chapter Room. Here, mastering his emotion as well as he could, with eyes and heart alike full as they noted each familiar spot, each

well-known scene, with here and there a recognized face looking up at him from among stranger-brethren, the Founder of Staouëli spoke once more from its Abbatial Chair. He chose the words of St. Paul, "Ecce tertio hoc venio ad vos," "Behold, the third time I have come among you." He reminded them how first, in 1843. he had come to this savage spot alone, or with one companion only, to plant the banner of the Cross, and to reclaim a desert for the service of God; how, for the second time, three years later, he had made his solemn entry as abbot into the newly-built monastery; and now . . . . and now . . . . for the third time he had come among them . . . . And as he spoke these words he burst into tears, and all the brethren wept with him.

After some moments of emotion, Dom Regis continued his speech, and traced the history of his beloved monastery from its establishment until that day, concluding with the words: "I left it a child—I find it a well-developed youth, full of fair promise." Then came the visits, he examining into every corner and minutia of the property, and applauding the results of the skill and labor of abbot and brethren, their extensive vineyards, their active distilleries, the well-watered fields, which Dom Augustine's peculiar aptitude for such work had made exceptionally fruitful by means of tiny rivulets and canals carefully conducted from spot to spot; then, as the secular world heard of his presence, his old friends flocked to see and welcome him. All was brightness and joy; and as he wrote to a friend:

"The sight of Algiers and of Staoueli moved me greatly. Staoueli is really beautiful. . . . . I found about forty of the brethren who were of my time. The plantations, the clearings of ground, the husbandry, everything has succeeded. The community is numerous; there are one hundred and twenty brothers and as many workmen, civil and military. The spirit of the house is good. I am satisfied!"

These words were, as it were, his "Nunc Dimittis" to Africa. For some years afterwards he lived on in Rome, working, without, at the affairs of the congregation, and within, at that harder task, his own sanctification, as one who knew that "the Lord was at hand." "My God," he wrote among his private papers, "I want to make myself a saint, *mais entre vous et moi*, but between Thyself and me, without anyone else in the world knowing it; everything else is nothing to me so long as I love Thee with all my heart, and that I am loved by Thee."

As his health failed, he was ordered by the physicians to a better climate, and his superiors desired him to accept a pressing invitation from some relatives to make a long stay in their chateau, whose situation offered the required temperature. It was the final sacrifice of his own will, for he earnestly desired to end his days

in one of the houses of his order; but, humble and obedient to the end, he took up his abode at Montbeton, where his days, weary rather than continuousiy suffering, were passed in solitude, prayer, and meditation, in the midst of a pious and affectionate circle of friends, until a stroke of apoplexy came to prelude his death-agony, and amid litanies and prayers, sacraments and benedictions, he passed away on the 13th of May, 1880.

But the love and the gratitude of his order did not leave him here. Nay, for they brought the frail body back where it would most have loved to rest, to his own Monastery of Staouëli. Once more it passed along that desert road, and entered the gates raised by his pious care. A magnificent tomb, designed by Dom Augustine himself, received the mortal remains of Francis Régis, and there he lies, awaiting the resurrection morn. There still waves, above the entrance-gate, the aged palm tree which first marked the site of his choice, and a vast silent village of monastic buildings cover the surrounding acres. About four hundred hectares of cultivated land bear witness to the successful industry of the brethren, including vineyards, arable land, and constructions of every description; and many a good work, not only in Algeria, but in the mother-country, reaps the reward of their labors in the alms and offerings which flow from their enriched coffers.

We learn from a Trappist annalist that

"The monastic property comprises about 1200 hectares, stretching out to south and north of Sidi-Ferruch. . . . . After twenty-three years of labor, most of their land is now cleared and prepared for cultivation. About one hundred and fifty hectares of cereals, corn, barley, and wheat, twelve of Indian corn, fifteen of kitchen garden, twenty-five of vineyards, are in full cultivation. They are trying the culture of cotton, and some years ago their fruit trees extended to 1500 feet of wall-fruit of varions kinds; apricots, pears, apples, pomegranates, oranges, lemons, almonds, and so on. They succeed well with linseed, sesame, colga, and other oil-yielding plants. The fathers work two lime-kilns, one brick-kiln, and several quarries, and were the first to introduce threshing-machines into Algeria. They had constructed viaducts to conduct the water from some distance to their plains, and their stables held seventy bullocks for harness, seventy milch-cows, twenty horses, a thousand sheep, and six hundred pigs."

It is not surprising that in one of the great French Exhibitions of Agriculture, the Trappists of Algeria should have won the gold medal awarded to "agricultural intelligence as exhibited in the best cultivated farm."

And now, one asks, what field does Madagascar offer for the like civilizing and religious labor in its plains? A correspondent of the "Figaro," at Algiers, has already interviewed—for this is the age of interviews—the present Abbot of Staouëli on the subject of their possible future colonization of Madagascar, and the following is their conversation, as reported in a French paper:

The Abbot of La Trappe received me very affably, and replied pleasantly to my questions, with a strong Toulousian accent.

"Shall you go to Madagascar?"

"It is my most earnest desire, for I consider that those who have already given up everything ought to be the first to go into danger. Madagascar is very unhealthy, and the numerous victims who have been sacrificed there already do not encourage French peasants, who are naturally timid, to settle there. Some one must set the example, therefore, and who can do this better than our fathers? See what they have done in this country, and what satisfactory results they have arrived at. Nevertheless, it is possible that we may not go to Madagascar. The question will be settled not by us, but by the superior-general, after a meeting of the various abbots who form the council of the order."

"Do you not think it rather extraordinary that Governor Laroche, who has left Catholicism to become a Protestant, should be the one to call upon Catholic monks for help?"

"Monsieur Laroche," replied Dom Louis, "is a man of high intelligence and absolute rectitude. Our fathers who knew him here, when he was Prefect in Algeria, know and appreciate his worth. He often came to hunt over our property, and dined with the abbot who preceded me. I do not know him personally, but from what I have heard I think that the government has chosen well. Monsieur Laroche, better than another, is fitted for a dangerous part, which necessitates the presence of a man with energy and tact. He has embraced Protestantism; well, so much the worse for him! But that should not prevent us from taking action. We must not object to stand side by side with others who are working from motives of humanity. Shall we go to Madagascar? The question has yet to be discussed. But it is certain that if it is answered in the affirmative the government must help us, must protect us, must assist us out, and must hand over a certain amount of cultifiable land to us."

"Are you not afraid of the English Methodists who have for so long been rooted in the island?"

"Not in the least! Whenever the Catholic monk encounters the Methodist, it is the latter that has to give way. What is more to be feared, if prompt action is not taken, is that the Jews will take possession of the best and richest parts of the island."

So for the Abbot of Staouëli; and now from another quarter we gather a much more glowing description. A well-known German writer, M. Wolff, says, in a letter to the "Tagblatt Berliner," that:

"Madagascar may be made the storehouse of France, if only the Creoles are prevented from taking possession of it. If the Creoles are allowed to do as they like in Madagascar every effort will be in vain. From Suberbieville to the frontier of Imerina the country is admirably fitted for the raising of cattle, while the mountain ranges will serve for sheep runs.

"France will be able to get from Madagascar all her provisions of wool, and will thus no longer need to depend for it on Australia or the Cape. Coffee, cocoa and tobacco will grow plentifully. In fact, it is an admirable and wonderful country, having its frigid zone, its temperate zone and its torrid zone; a country where all imaginable products of the earth grow and flourish. I know of no other country where, side by side with the banana and the mango, you find the apple tree and the strawberry, or where, as in the market of Tananarine, you may see side by side the European potato and the eastern *patate*, or sweet potato. I would willingly give all the parts of Africa which I have visited in exchange for Madagascar, with the firm conviction of having made a good bargain! In case of war, too, everything necessary is to be found in the island—food, fuel and minerals—so that Madagascar is destined, in my eyes, to play an important part in future international considerations."

Whether, then, a second Staouëli will arise in that distant land only the future can tell; if such should be the decision of the Trappist Council, we know that the splendid self-devotion, the earnest labor, the entire self-abnegation of some future founder will be as fruitful, as glorifying to his Divine Master, as were the life and work of Francis Regis in the old, yet ever new, toil-worn, yet ever stainless habit of sweet St. Bernard, under the burning southern sun.

FRANCE. T. L. L. TEELING.

THE SITUATION IN ROME.

ABOUT the situation in Rome, as it was during the month of September, 1895, *The Saturday Review* then wrote as follows: "Italy has hardly moved forward in any respect during the last twenty-five years which have elapsed since the last French zouave quitted Rome and the vanguard of the Savoyard's troops marched in by *Porta Pia*. New problems and changed conditions occupy the attention of the rest of Europe. The Italian Kingdom lags behind, not far from where September of 1870 found her, still engrossed in the apparently impossible task of digesting the Papacy. The national energies have been concentrated upon this solitary undertaking, to the exclusion of everything else. The abnormal outlay upon an army and navy several sizes too large for the country is only one of a number of sacrifices which the attempt has involved."

The writer of the article next proceeded to detail some of the efforts made in this connection, and then concluded his statement: "The acquisition of Rome has, in fact, sterilized the Italian Monarchy. The vehement protests of Pius IX. and the no less effective, if more suave, obstinancy of Leo XIII. have availed to keep the Roman Question alive for a quarter of a century. It is well known that the Vatican holds in reserve a great host of pious voters, who have never yet exercised the right of suffrage; its influence over the women of Italy is as powerful as ever. These elements of resistance can at a given signal be turned into an offensive force, strong enough to wreck any ministry, and perhaps a dynasty along with it. It is to nobody's interest that this stupid dead-lock should continue. Fortunately, there seem to be indica-

tions that a solution, or rather a compromise, is no longer regarded by those most closely concerned as altogether out of the question."

There is much matter for profitable meditation in these paragraphs of the habitually acute not less than suggestively written periodical. That periodical, we may reasonably suppose, regarded the situation in Rome objectively, and, as we may also suppose, was at least not moved by any feeling of sympathy towards the Papacy. We, therefore, quote its judgment because this may be regarded both as impartially made and as representative of the views which candid observers in every part of the world must, some willingly, others unwillingly, some at an earlier, others at a later date, be brought to entertain about the situation in Rome and in Italy.

The statement bears witness to the fact that Italy has absorbed the Papacy without assimilating it. The conception of this fact must be the groundwork of every just conception of the situation. The statement, furthermore, bears witness to the fact that Italy has expended the best of her energies during a quarter of a century in a vain endeavor to assimilate the Papacy, and that instead of showing any promise of a better success in the future she is compelled, for the sake of internal peace, to confront the alternative of compromise or of chronic disorder. This may be taken to be the permanent condition of the Italian State in respect to the Papal Church. The desired solution has not yet come, but the "stupid dead-lock" continues.

And to set still more in relief the impartiality of the statement, regarded as an expression of unbiassed opinion, we may point out that it was made during a season when international comity or courtesy would have disposed even a *Saturday Review* to an expression of good-will, since at that moment Italy was ostentatiously solemnizing "the Silver Jubilee" of her "wedding with Rome," which "wedding" is here represented, under a very different figure of speech, as the swallowing of the last Papal morsel.

Consequently, we possess in this statement a high level of favor towards Italy, and a corresponding or lower level of favor, or even of indifference, towards the Papacy; favor and indifference which are duly opposed and duly combined in the forming of an estimate. Yet, this estimate is an explicit recognition of the rightfulness of the Papal demands. Catholics do not stand in need of such support, for they have been accustomed to neglect, but they may set some store by such a testimony. There have been given many such, but the present one has been quoted here simply because, within a brief and correct outline, it summarizes the existing situation and indicates the hopeless nature of the evil until a compromise shall have been sought and attained.

It has been, and is, the password among those who are averse to the Papal claims to say that there is no Roman Question. The thing has been done to death, and the insistence and obstinacy with which, in Italy especially, the denial has been bandied about are very much akin to the frantic methods of the traditional atheist who acts as though he had resolved his negation into a positive belief.

We will here take for granted that there is a Roman Question. If there is, Catholics have a duty of considering it and of approaching it with all possible courage and with the fewest possible preconceptions. Within a score of years not only the conditions but the possibilities of the case have changed. The view which appears to prevail in the Roman Curia is most likely to be the correct one, yet few Catholics are thoroughly conversant with it. It tentatively embraces, or tends towards, a solution which is offered, or strongly suggested, by the situation itself. It is, therefore, the most obvious and, at the same time, the most natural. It is also the least difficult of effectuation.

To describe it, or rather to characterize it, in a somewhat philosophical manner, we may say that many, at least, of the best-informed regard a solution as possible, as potentially near though practically distant, and this because not visible to the vulgar eye. If it be such, and if it be entertained in such quarters, it must recommend itself even to all those non-Catholic Christians who cherish the desire of a lasting and effective peace between Church and State.

The month of January, 1890, and the same month in 1897, may be regarded as the time-limits of any description of the present moral and material situation in Italy as regards the Roman Question. From 1870 to 1875 ran one marked period; from 1879 to 1889 another not less marked. Though clearly distinguished by the characteristics proper to them, their precise limits of time are either not easily discernible or are unimportant. They were highly marked by events. To these two periods has succeeded a third, which is at present incomplete, but which shows more important, though less salient, characteristics than those possessed by either of its forerunners. It is a period of reflection.

That elapsing between 1870 and 1879 should have been, like an "era" in geology, a period of formation, adaptation and preparation. It was the first period of the Italian domination in Rome, yet it was scarcely less stagnant, as far as thought was concerned, than it was inoperative as far as commencements were concerned; a period not so much of transition as of simple inaction. The Italian Government stood—it did not even so much as sit—with its hands folded. A man to whom opportunity and conscience dictate at cross-purposes is often stimulated into feverish activity

after he has preferred to follow opportunity rather than to obey conscience. The paradox of Italian inaction from 1870 to 1875 is explained by the uncertainty of the tenure held of the Holy City. The pictures then presented survive, obsolete and grotesque, in the minds of some Catholics. It was a period not of stagnation only, but of stupefaction also, they were told; a demonstration of the folly of Victor Emanuel in hoping to rule in the Papal City, they were also told. All this was well enough, had its consequences not been come to be joined with every possible phase of the Italian occupation. Without the Pope, they also learned, grass would grow in the streets of Rome; while, on the other hand, no potentate but he could establish a secure footing in the Eternal City. The first things have changed; the others were part of a kindly superstition which Divine Providence has allowed to be falsified, and was like to the reverential pseudo-prophecy about the years of Peter in the supreme Pontificate. Indeed, the Italians did not at first seem to have come to stay. Their sovereign, or his minister, Sella, had affirmed the contrary: *a Roma ci siamo e ci resteremo;*[1] but for a spell of years the fiat was not lived up to. The new masters dwelt in furnished rooms, so to speak. Victor Emanuel might almost have been mistaken for a royal guest outstaying his welcome in the summer residence of his friend, the Pope. At the worst he resembled Charles VIII., and it was more probable that Pius IX. would have enthralled his conscience and subdued his will than that Alexander VI. should have compelled the French conqueror to cower on his knees. The Pope was in a plight only a little worse than that of Leo IX. after the battle of Civitella, and the king, in his devotion, was not altogether dissimilar to the Norman adventurer. Therefore, the native Romans were emboldened to make the most rigorous resistance of which they were capable. Their *bon mots* were diverted from the incidental foibles of the former Government to the natural constitution of the new. The one had been derided because paternal;[2] the other was detested because liberal and intrusive. Their inevitable gibes and delicious pasquinades were multiplied, used as the equivocal output of some hatred and much contempt, and given a novel permanence in gusty sheets.[3] Altogether, there was no cohesion between the old and new in Rome. There was not even adhesion. When the environs of Rome were darkened with Cadorna's host

[1] This bald dictum, *Here we are and here we stay*, has been injudiciously compared to the *Hic manebimus optime*. The comparison is unfortunate, from a literary point of view, at least.

[2] Mary Lafon has been at pains to read a perfect fanaticism of rebellion into the secular ebullitions of Roman fun *before* 1870.

[3] *La Frusta*, etc.

on the eve of the breach, the Pope was reported to have declared that Rome could not undergo capture. It could be invaded, but it could not, would not, be taken. His confidence was not shared by all the good, but it was accepted by very many, even of the indifferent. When the city actually fell, some of the devout believed that it would not be entered; when it had been entered, they felt sure that it could not be held. In general, the faith in a miraculous intervention was changed, in regard not so much to its object as to circumstantial details. The confidence in the benign and mysterious power of the unarmed Pontiff was nourished. Thus it was that not only the more loyal believers and adherents but many of the less disinterested waited and did not rally to the dominant power.

Then a change came. The ensuing period has been well described in a summary way by a French writer:[1] "*On s'aperçut alors que la France ayant repoussé, par la main des catholiques libéraux qui s'etaient fait ses repondants, la salut que la monarchie allait lui apporter, ne tarderait pas de renvoyer ce gouvernment bâtard, qui ne voulait pas faire le mal, mais qui était impuissant à organiser le bien. Le gouvernment français penchait à gauche, la France ne comptait plus pour la Sainte Siege, et Victor-Emmanuel pouvait jouir en paix des fruits de son usurpation. Alors on poussa activement les travaux d'assainissement et d'embellissement et on commença la transformation de Rome. En 1874, la population est de 256,000 habitants et s'elève graduellement chaque année. En 1885, elle était de 345,036 individus, avec un accroisement de 11,000 personnes. Suivant cette moyenne, nous sommes au dessus de la verité, en assignant maintenant à Rome (Mai, 1887) une population totale de 368,000 habitants.*[2] *L'augmentation de la population de Rome est un fait assez facile á expliquer. Le gouvernment voulant s'établir solidement dans sa nouvelle capitale dont il connaissait bien l'attachement au Saint Siege, n'avait que le choix entre deux moyens; déporter les vaincus, ou les noyer dans la masse des vainqueurs. Le premier procédé, qui est le plus ancien etait plus radical; mais heureusement il n'est plus dans nos moeurs force était de se contenter du second.*"

So an aspect of stability was given to the Italian sojourn here. The huge and tasteless structures of the new Rome arose to receive, in straitness or squalor, the denizens who came to fill the city and to make it the antithesis of all that it had been in the past. We will here digress so far as to say that the Government which

[1] M. Felix Grimaldi, *Rome Après* 1870, pp. 162–3–4. He assigns 1874 as the date of change. The difference is immaterial, both for the reason given above and for this other, that he takes 1874 as a point of starting, not as one of realization.

[2] I have omitted a sentence from the quotation. The population of Rome is now of about 435,000 souls. Before 1870 it counted less than 200,000.

erected these structures may abide here as long as they continue to resist the swayings of storms and the force of centripetal attraction. Without the casualties of an earthquake or a siege they, and the Government with them, may abide here the tenth part of a cycle. To say so is not to make a prophecy, if only because a prophecy would be valueless. But it is not useless to record the expression, naturally only approximate, of what has been learned by watching the Roman Question undergo submergence and return, and by computing the strength and weakness of the opposing parties and the efficacy with which the protests sent out from the Vatican reverberate against the Aurelian walls. Nor need an inference drawn from the construction of the new city be unduly fanciful. There is much of reasonableness, as well as of naturalness, in the sentiment of how symbolic is the setting of stones in order for the building of the homes of men, of how an innate, though perhaps unconscious, conviction of transitoriness may make itself felt in the dull, cemented stones destined to stand as witnesses through years, through centuries or through ages. The low-walled Palatine of Romulus soon gave place to a commencement more worthy of *Aurea Roma*. Augustus found the city of brick and left it of marble. Italian Rome was jerry-built.[1] But its jerry-built houses need not crumble in the course of a century.

In a finer way, too, the new Rome contrasted itself wantonly, and to its great damage, with its predecessor. It was not necessary that there should have been a guiding inspiration of perpetual dominion in the structures set up during the seventies and the eighties, but it was desirable that there should have been the express significance of a healthful and solid art.[2] On the contrary, the sicklily self-conscious artificiality of stucco Rome arose, the gods beholding and the world of culture blaspheming. In this the new builders were more eloquent than it was either decorous or prudent for them to have been.

Intimately related, as cause to effect, as part and counterpart, to these were other moral manifestations. There was an appetite for bigness, though there was no taste for grandeur. To satisfy this appetite, which was also a pressing one in point of time, imaginary wealth and credit came into existence, flourished, and fell into an abyss of debt and collapse, leaving in its stead ruin, and, worst of

[1] I am speaking of Europe, and not of America; but the case is the same, with changes, *mutatis mutandis*, in America also. The flimsiness of Constantinople was not a generally pervading characteristic. *Cf.* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xvii. The *Cloaca Maxima* of Tarquinius is still the principal sewer of Rome.

[2] It is the same in things great and small. A wretched and suspicious-looking booth near the bridge of S. Angelo bears the following inscription over its veiled entrance: *L'Arte rinnova i popoli, e ne rivela la vita.* The inscription might serve as a characterization of the entire city. It is a grandiloquent parody.

all, an overgrown and parasitical population, one item of which was sixty thousand workingmen without work.[1]

The collapse befell with something of the melodramatic; with loud fallings of stately banks and financial associations; with popular protestations and clamor, and with the semblance of, or an ineffectual attempt at, a public revolution; but, for the greater part, the evil wrought itself out sullenly, almost silently. Its gradual evolution—for the trouble is still a present one—has flowed over the riots of 1889 and become, with slight modifications, a characteristic of the third period. The vast ruin has engendered vaster discontent and skepticism still more comprehensive about the ideals and inspirations of the Revolution. Evil multiplies in progression, and the disasters of the second period assumed national dimensions.

Hence it may be, that if the murmurs have lapsed into quiescence, the endurance of calamity in silence may have become a permanent fact of ill-boding significance. Another people might not suffer fools gladly in high places and robbers in the centres of ruling, but the Italian people could scarcely make a revolution in any circumstances whatsoever. A people, however, which is not ardent enough for a revolution must be cool enough for reflection. The distinction points the solution of the Roman Question.

Reflection, then, is giving wisdom to the generation of to-day. The period in which the Italian people are now living is one of rumination.

And this brings us to the purely moral phenomena of the situation. The people think they are, by nature, cunning and self-seeking, as might have been suspected from the conscious nature of their art and the reiteration of their claims to be reputed idealists. They are, above all else, seekers for bread, and neither Heaven nor men will judge them severely for this. They have worked up their fictitious enthusiasms, lived through a crisis, and, the experiment over, settled down to gather the fruits of their experience.

To their thinking, or at least to the thinking of very many among them, one fact protrudes itself more forward than any other. They, like the French on the eve of the Terror, have the

[1] The material aspect of that period has been made famous by Mr. F. Marion Crawford in one of his Roman novels. We are concerned with the moral aspect. It is curious to observe in this connection the alliance between the two orders of phenomena and the way in which both have forced the Roman Question into prominence. After the building craze, financial crisis and *Panamino*, came the African disasters. The three former originated in the desire to make a home in Rome; the last, in the ambition to form a colony abroad. All of them sprang from the situation created by the Papacy; in Africa, many of the weapons of Menelik's troops were the discarded arms sequestrated from the Papal army in 1870.

millennium, but they have not bread. The occasion, perhaps the cause, of their poverty has been this enterprise against "the priests,"—*i preti*—,for their poverty has been not lessened but increased by the coming to Rome, and was insufferably augmented by the disasters which Rome produced. To the material chasm created in the hour of crisis corresponds a cleft in the moral situation now—a cleft which has not been repaired, which has remained, and which has expanded, and which may go on widening until it have set at difference every element in the nation, every department of the public, and of the private life of the people every family, almost every household.[1] For Christ has come to set men asunder.

In this maelstrom of the present—if the conditions of good-natured and perhaps flaccid people deserve such a name—in this turmoil, at least, search must be made for every evidence or glimmering indication of forecast about the future of the Papal question. If the conditions of thought and feeling and the posture of facts, political and social, existing in Italy to-day do not present the picture of a maelstrom, it is due to the absence of the necessary agitation, not to that of confusion; due in general to the mild acceptance given to the facts and not to the want of potency in the facts themselves. Perhaps these conditions present rather the picture of a sea. Every presentment of the condition of Italian affairs is illusory, because of the various and conflicting causes which escape from investigation or which defy analysis, and also because we exaggerate and minimize in our inability to resolve into truthful figures the paradoxes which substantively disclose themselves to our observation. To be at all accurate, we should be tediously careful neither to minimize the strong eddyings of Italian thought nor to exaggerate the impetuosity of the reflux. To the landsman, as has been well said, the ocean seems to be one huge, immeasurable and equal flood, obeying as a mass the simple law of ebb and flow, and offering to the navigator a single uniform force, whereas in reality it is the movement of myriad streams urged by a thousandfold direct and contrary impulses, so that its seeming uniformity covers the energy of countless currents and counter-currents, making the sea-floor to be not even and the same, but an unequal surface, the resultant of varied conditions of elevation and subsidence; not one mass, but the aggregate of many masses, each moving along definite and particular lines.

May we not all have gone too far, *á la* de Maistre, in identifying for the most part naturally disparate forces of Philosophism and Revolutionism? It was rather "the Evangel according to Jean

[1] In Italy the word *family* is used in a tribal sense; the *household* represents the American *family*.

Jacques" than the apocalyptic infidelity of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists which brought the revolutionary movement to birth. The latter graduated the planes for the downrushing of the old-constituted polity of the world; but the predominant among the specifically determining forces, the real agency, was intrinsically and derivatively not religious but social, and directed, when in action, against the State, which suffered final suppression, not against the Church, which is for evermore. Long before the Law of Prairial or the Festival of the Supreme Being, the movement which we call the French Revolution was formed, set on the way to its own completion or annihilation and to the achievement of its aims. It was also made irresistible by virtue of its internal constitution not less than by favoring circumstances, though of this last it may have been uncertain or unconscious. There existed all that which constitutes a human movement, a volume of thought incorporated in a living and powerful body. The entity thus constituted not only began its career, but discharged many of its primary functions without employing the terror of its calm or maddened onslaughts against the Church. That was the French Revolutionary movement. Its degeneration into madness, its making war upon religion, its reverting to barbarism have puzzled its admirers[1] and tended to hurry Christians into the delusion that the enemies of king-craft were the enemies of Christianity also. But impartial history can scarcely hesitate to admit that the revolution which Louis XVI. mistook for a revolt was an uprising against over-taxation, an uprising prompted by the want of bread and determined by the scrutiny which revealed the immediate and mediate responsibility of the *Seigneurs*. The *peuple taillable et corvéable à merci et misericorde* had no direct quarrel with priests, and it was long before, by a perversion, war began to be made against the rank and file of the French clergy and against the status of its members as the ministers of a spiritual religion.

The acknowledged identity of the Revolution in Italy with that which preceded it in France would suffice to show that the latter was not essentially or necessarily anti-religious.

The Revolution which in Italy overthrew seven dynasties and set the descendant of Humbert the White-handed on a throne in the Quirinal Palace was a *bourgeois*[2] re-enactment and repetition of the French Revolution. In some ways it was a parody; in other ways a vitalized and worthy repetition.

We are living in the centenary of the introduction of the Tricolor

[1] See, for instance, Lord Macaulay's essay on Sir James Mackintosh's *History of the Revolution*, and his other on Hallam's *Constitutional History*.

[2] We hope that it is not necessary to apologize for the use of the foreign term, which is the only exact expression of our idea.

in the Cisalpine Republic.[1] The Italian generation of 1797 was too much a thing of periwigs, powder and paint to become sincerely revolutionary or thoroughly subversive. But many wholesouled revolutionaries were begotten out of its loins. The new Italian revolutionary might be all or something of, let us say, Robespierre or Marat, of Timoleon or Harmodius, of either Brutus, of Cola di' Rienzo, of Giovanni Capocci, or of Pier Capponi. He conformed more or less to one or other of these types, in proportion as he was more or less *bourgeois*. His ideals were as much as possible Italian. The non-classic and least old of these types had smaller efficacy, and even among the older there were gradations of honor and of imitation. For other reasons the more Catholic and conservative Cola di' Rienzo and Pier Capponi might undergo obscuration while Stepano Porcari and Giovanni Capocci might become more resplendently exemplar.[2] The types were varied and even confusing, and so were those who conformed to them. The revolutionaries should have been demagogues, but they were not always such. The leaders, however, were often tribunes, and it might have seemed impossible to be successfully revolutionary after the days of Terror without becoming democratic. Whether this was or was not the inevitable condition of being a revolutionary *au complet*, the Revolution could at no time have triumphed unaided. Its adherents were but a fraction of the people before the middle of the century. Hence the Red-shirts, even after so late a date as 1860, few in number, were recruited from the royal forces of Piedmont,[3] and for their own dear cause they achieved little and served a royal master on behalf of another

---

[1] The Senator-Poet Carducci is the last of a long line of witnesses to the substantial identity of the two revolutions. See the eloquent peroration of his speech on the centenary of the Tricolor: *O giovani, contemplaste mai con la visione dell' anima questa bandiera, quando ella dal Campidoglio riguarda i colli e il piano fatale onde Roma discese e lanciossi alla vittoria e all' incivilimento del mondo? O quando dalle antenne di San Marco spazia sul mare che fu nostro e o par che spii nell' Orente i regni della commerciante e guerreggiante Venezia? O quando dal Palazzo de' Priori saluta i clivi a cui Dante saliva poetando, da cui Michelangelo scendeva creando, su cui Galileo sancì la conquista dei cieli? Se una favilla vi resti ancora nel sangue dei nostri padri del Quarantotto e del Sessanta, non vi pare che su i monumenti della gloria vetusta questo vessillo della patria esulti più bello e diffonda più lieti i colori della sua gioventù?* In this, its youth, the movement was an offspring of the French Revolution. In moments of fervor the Tricolor waved gloriously over the legionaries of an idea; in moments of desperation it was folded not less gloriously but mournfully over them. All the enthusiasts who were gathered from Ticino to Caltanisetta to fight the battles of independence lived and died in the faith of the Tricolor. It was the banner not of the epopee only, but of unification also.

[2] Because both had unremittingly resisted Popes, and because the theatre of the actions of both had been the Papal City itself.

[3] The historians and chroniclers of the movement allege facts in support of this assertion. See, for instance, Th. O'Clery, *The Making of Italy*.

cause. The king had to rely upon the elements which the country afforded, and the *bourgeoisie* was everywhere the predominant power. For the purchase of the kings[1] and its co-operation, the movement initiated by *Sansculottes* and continued by *Carbonari* became a *bourgeois* Revolution, a precise parallel to which has been seen nowhere else.

The inherence of this quality in the Revolution must be borne in mind during every survey of Italy as it is to-day. The well-dressed citizen[2] decorates his house with the portraits of Mazzini and Garibaldi. With his family he listens to the *Inni* of both, and of Goffredo Mameli, while he sips iced drinks during the music played in the public piazzas in the soft summer time. The emollient seasons maintain the character which they have helped to make.

From these strange conditions, apparently like, but in reality quite unlike, to those existing under the Third Republic in France, various conclusions may be drawn.

The first may be this: that a *bourgeois* is always a *bourgeois*, never a *prolétaire*. If, therefore, any question arise, even a question of the stability of the State, it will appear to him to be quite secondary compared with the stability of property. In every contingency he will use his power on behalf of the stability of the existing body politic. That is why he can be loyal now, and that is why he could be disloyal at a juncture, and why his loyalty, after a juncture, would be readily attached to a new master. He is unchanging in nature and desire under every flag. He cannot change. His conditions may change. Then he adapts his old feelings and methods to his new environment. He cannot but love his houses and his rent-rolls, if he possesses them, or his apartment, if he does not, even as he cherishes his wife and children with incomparable fondness. Whether the theoretic distinctions between the universal *meum* and his particular *tuum* be clearly or faintly discernible to him, there is always that sheet-anchor of his possessions, great or small, to save him from being swept into the full stream of revolutionary thought.

The second conclusion may be this: that in becoming a half-hearted abettor of the revolutionists he has diluted "the sweet and heady must of their new liberty," watered down the wine of madness from which every good democrat of necessity drinks to keep himself in life, and not only given his color to the victorious party, but also secured its control. Thus he has made democracy

[1] The sovereigns of the two Sicilies, of Tuscany and even of Parma had been invited to co-operate and share or absorb the spoil. Piedmont, which was less powerful than the two Sicilies, accepted the offer.

[2] Even though he be a church-goer.

a failure in Italy; its representatives in Parliament, in the press and in public opinion weak; its followers few, its creed sterile. The *bourgeois* has his titled betters with him, but he is the predominant partner.[1]

The third conclusion may be this: that just as lawyers prove to be the best legislators, so the men of the middle class, like to lawyers in sobriety of desires and objectivity of perception, are the most healthful and hopeful elements in the Italian State, estimated from the point of view of the Papal question, and from almost every other rational standpoint. The members of the middle class of Italian society cannot but discriminate. They will not, because they cannot, easily lend themselves to the machinations of those who would destroy the existing order, because they are organically incapable of sharing the enthusiasm of destroyers. Elsewhere they compose the stable element in the State. So do they here also. In a country revolutionized to their liking and by their consent,[2] they cannot but wield a similar influence over the destinies of the body politic, and scarcely less over the spheres of the moral world. They give the intonation to thought and to action.

There has been a great mis-reading of these aspects of Italian life. Italy has been represented as a Catholic nation asleep. The figure halts with more than the ordinary lameness of tropes. The Italian *bourgeoisie* first distinguished the major premiss of a syllogism and then proceeded to make a revolution. Those who see the revolution, and who will not conceive of the distinction, will never cease to be mystified by what they see in Italy. The Italian revolutionaries absolutely repudiated, and still repudiate, both in theory and in practice, what they were told by their teachers to regard as priestly encroachment on legitimate national aspirations.

No purpose can be served by blinking this fact. Accepting it, we cease to wonder when we look on a class which has dethroned

---

[1] It might very well be argued that Italy, which has the largest titular nobility in the world, has hardly any aristocracy. But it might be argued with equal plausibility that there is no *bourgeosie*, in agreement with and in contradiction to which it may be replied that everybody who is not a prince, duke or *prolétaire* is a *bourgeois*. Princely and ducal titles were only given in the Italian States having kings for sovereigns; hence the counts and untitled *Nobili* of Tuscany, which was ruled by a grand duke, must be regarded as the equivalents of princes and dukes. By the Italian *bourgeoisie* I mean the proprietery classes who possess something in contradistinction to the *prolétaires* who possess nothing, and to the nobles who actually perform, or who might perform, the duty of satellites at the courts of the Vatican, of the Quirinal, of Palermo, Naples, Florence, Monza, Turin, etc. The Italian *prolétariat* is an inert mass; the nobles are elegant trifles. Only the middle class has to be reckoned with.

[2] Not, however, in the same degree with their active co-operation. It would not be untrue to say that, after they had given their concurrence to the movement, the common people fought at their behest.

the Pope and still preserved its spiritual allegiance to him—an allegiance which is specifically different from that of the modern Frenchman who receives the sonship of God in Baptism and who approaches the Holy Table on the verge of youth, but who, during the remainder of his passage to the grave, sees priests only quite casually, at the funerals of his friends and the christening of his friends' children, and who dies, too often, without the consoling ministrations of those about whom he has had so little concern. The Italians of the middle class have no cult other than that of Christianity, yet they, for the most part, feel a need of religion—a need which, when perceived at all, must be imperiously recognized, if not effectively obeyed. The overwhelming majority of them obey it in practice, but modify its teaching with the distinction mentioned above. Therefore they profess themselves to be religious—at the worst after the manner of the profoundly religious knights whom the American met at the Court of King Arthur. Be this religiousness great or small, practical or unpractical, it does not, and it probably will not, act in any notable degree upon their political consciences unless the Papal question be raised in the highest circles.

In a State which is unstable as well as nervous by reason, let us suppose, of chronic dyspepsia, the stability which the *bourgeois* supplies to it is not such as to give it any satisfactory assurance of immunity from grave and perhaps fatal disasters in the future. Two efficient and necessary supports to every State should be found in the clergy and the middle class. In Italy the clergy is hostile; the support of the middle class precarious by reason of the hostility of the clergy. For just as the *bourgeois* is loyal to the interests of the Government in so far as they are identified with those of the nation, so the Papacy, when actually obliged to use measures of hostility, is most meticulous in distinguishing between the Government and the nation. The distinction does not pass the comprehension of the people. Hence the active fury of anti-clericalism has gone out of date. Could it be shown that the interests of the Papacy and of the nation were radically and permanently the same, a process of elimination against the common cause of discord would eventually come into play.

There are not wanting indications that such may fall out; nor are those who direct the action of the Papacy by any means blind to the fact, that were the full and necessary evidences of such a community of interests given, the other obstacles might not long bar the way to a perfect and lasting peace. A case in point occurred, when, in the spring of 1896, Leo XIII. used his good offices with the Negus on behalf of the Italian prisoners at the prompting of a desire to succor Italy[1] in an hour of desperation.

[1] That it is: the people and the country, not the Government.

It is natural that even the purely religious influence should be made some account of. A class which is not fervently religious may still be partially, if not totally, actuated by religious motives. The momenta in causation are, almost always, not less numerous than complex, and in the collective force of causes one propellent factor is always present and generally discoverable. Such is often the influence of religion. It is in great crises that religion imposes its authority most effectually upon the political elements of nations. Princes go to Canossa in an hour of weakness, and States seek the timely help of the Church in the face of impending disaster. Thus not the Italian middle class only, but the Monarchy itself, might make an offer of peace, but, directly or derivatively, the power of impulsion resides in the entire body of the people, and most of all in the middle class. Now, the interests of the Italian people require, nay are, peace and prosperity at home, protection and honor abroad. As long as the feud between Church and State endures there may be prosperity, but there can be no secure and lasting peace. Nor will the absence of this secure and lasting peace be made evident only theoretically. The disorder is enteric. The last test of truth lies in the application of facts. It is undoubted that at least a large minority[1] of the Italians would be conscience-stricken if drastic measures were used against the Holy See in their name, would be paralyzed by Papal prohibitions in the case of a demand for their co-operation on behalfof the State in a cause which the Pontiff placed under a ban, and would always remain of such unalterable conviction as to the rightfulness of his demands and the injustice of the refusal to entertain them that they would utilize, or allow to be utilized, a moment of danger to the Government to establish peace. The attempt might be dangerous; but they are already so militant, that is, so courageous and so well organized, that their future fidelity to their public professions must be reckoned with as a certainty. To use an Italian form of speech, there is not a dog in Italy that does not know all this. In application it embraces, with relative distinctions, both the Catholic and half-Catholic sections of the nation. But if this be admitted, it follows that the identity of interest between the *bourgeoisie* and the Roman Pontificate is so strong as to create a variety of possibilities in which not only a recognition of national interests but even a sensibility to the claims of the Pontiff could bring an already formidable and apparently increasing number of Italians to his side. But we wish to observe that such combinations as those indicated would spring rather from the general rela-

[1] Upwards of 50 per cent. of the Italian electors abstain from the voting-booths in obedience to the Pontifical injunction that they shall *neither elect nor be elected.*

tion of the four ideal conditions of the country to the Roman Question than from any peculiar and exceptional causes. In the circumstances which would promote the proposal and accomplishment of a consideration of the Papal claims, we must distinguish two kinds: the one, of those which would arise from some agreeable incident; a brochure coming from the pen of a notable personage, the Sovereign meeting with a Cardinal and discussing "reconciliation," the advocating of a reconsideration by some high-placed political personage, etc.; the other, of those which would be more imperious and at the same time calamitous; bankruptcy, an insurrection, a war, etc. Upon such grave casualties as these latter, of which the potentiality for producing or allowing change is the greatest possible, foresight can be but indifferently and conjecturally exercised, though, except in the hypothesis that a Republican or Anarchical Government were set up, the chances should, from the outset, tell strongly in favor of the Holy See.[1] It is sufficient that the general exigencies of the country should have a pertinent relation to the Papal question in order to arouse religious and semi-religious discord of a nature so acute as to bring the question forward as one of actuality. There can be no settled peace while a prince remains in the Vatican surrounded with a numerous and avowed following, and possessed of an influence on the conscience of almost every citizen.[2] Prosperity is intimately allied to peace. There can be no prosperity, assured against injury, while his energetically reiterated protestations periodically set the political world agog. By the character and security of the peace and prosperity enjoyed at home will be regulated the protection and respect enjoyed abroad. Most of all must be borne in mind a double historic law bearing upon the case. Discord between Church and State has uniformly borne this character: that the religious loyalty of the people is restrained within forms of passivity and subordinated, as far as may be, even at the price of sacrifice, to loyalty towards the State. There is a parallel to this in the lives of individuals. The calls of spiritual interest are made secondary to those of temporal interest in all except great things and by all except pious people, but the power of *revanche* is inherent in the command which the spiritual order possesses. In the crises of the individual lifetime, and in moments of reflex and fully introspective thought and of sudden illumination, the majesty and superiority of the spiritual order are

[1] I believe that the Holy See would prefer either of these systems, if established, to the Monarchy, since the difficulty would then, for obvious reasons, be set on the high-road to adjustment. But to covet the end is not to desire the means.

[2] This last phrase is a variation on one used by Signor Crispi in his memorable article in *The New Review*.

enthrallingly realized and instinctively obeyed. The very instinctiveness of such obedience intensifies the energy of the actors. So, in countries rent with a politico-religious quarrel, the ordinary tenor of combating tells in favor of the more pressing and present demands of the State, but in acute stages, when the issue is tried in a particular engagement, fortune more often favors the spiritual power, while the enduringness of the resistance of the latter almost invariably gives it victory in the long run. The tactics, so to call them, of the antagonist of the State are more expensive, provoke more defeats, entail the necessities of a less splendid warfare, but possess a superior promise of triumph.

Thus in Italy, the Papacy following a magnanimous conduct of abstention from open and aggressive hostility for the good of the Italians, and obeying an historic law which affords a promise of victory only the more consoling in proportion as the incidental losses of an habitually passive resistance are galling, enjoys the rational confidence that, should the trend of ordinary events fail to give it justice, it holds in its control the factors which are decisive in a crisis.

A precise measure of the possibilities thus presented lies in an estimate of the religious forces at the disposal of the Vatican. A less direct but scarcely less significant measure may be found in the calculations made by the Italian Government itself. This is an appreciation of that.

The present hour supplies us with one of this kind—with a measure which, if duly considered, would dispense with the need for any other. Di Rudini has broken up a servile Parliament in order to reorganize a political party and a moral power against the only real danger of the Italian State—the Catholic party.[1]

A glance at the direct indications amply justifies the conviction of the Premier.

The readiest of these indications may be found in an estimate of the forces displayed by the Catholic reaction now in progress.

The Catholic reaction was shrouded in that obscurity of a dawn broken only by faint glimmerings which is the prelude of great and triumphal movements. As it was with the Catholics of Italy, so it may be with the Socialists of Italy—years of unnoticed preparation were followed by a sudden success.

The first signs of awakening from the long night of inaction were given when they resolved to make strenuous efforts to assert themselves at the municipal and provincial elections. The open-

[1] The assertion is capable of detailed proof, *a priori* and *a posteriori*. The motive of the Noble Marquis has, however, been publicly stated by his organ, *Il Don Chisciotte di Roma*, in an article signed by the editor, *Il Saraceno*, and printed during the month of January.

ing year of 1894 gave them the predominant power in the Communal Council of the Southern Metropolis; from being a small minority they came to be an overwhelming majority at Naples. Then in the late summer of 1895 the polling for the administrative elections, both municipal and provincial, gave them the balance of power in half the strongholds of anti-Clericalism. While they girded themselves for victory, the idle vaporings of the Liberals—always prone to exaggeration and always ready to self-glorification—would have shaken the faith of any distant observer. But these suffered defeat after defeat; and their rout was all the more inglorious because they had always boasted that Clericalism, as they always will call militant Catholicism, was a *quantité negligeable*. The costs which they had to count, reckoned retrospectively and prospectively, amounted to moral insolvency. They belonged to a party which had vaunted that it was not only master in the field, but numerically overpowering; they had taken their stand not on the transitory basis of a political party, but on that which belonged to the compact and invulnerable majority of a nation. Ever since the days of battle, when they built up the unity with disasters like those of Lissa and Custozza, more especially since the pitiful[1] siege of Rome, they had lived through a time of apotheosis, and in all this long apotheosis they had made it their boast that they were ninety-five per cent of the nation; that they were the nation. How, then, without giving promise of imminent ruin, could their power collapse at this onrushing of the *gens lucifuga* of the political world? They had said, *L'etat c'est moi*, and, lo! at Fermo and Thiene, at Bassano (Veneto) and Ancona, at Venice and Treviso and Savona there appeared, in the words of a Liberal paper,[2] "a crushing majority, a host of most black[3] candidates upholding without reticence and without human respect the banner of the Pope-king." Where he did not conquer the Socialists did, as at Imola, because the Catholics abstained from voting. That was the accomplished revival of Catholicism in Italy. It had been pinioned with red tape, suppressed, cancelled. It was revived, powerful, triumphant, fearless, uncompromising, demonstrative. It could not be crushed, for the efforts made to crush it had failed, and they had been the completest of all possible efforts. It had the double strength which is in a reaction; it cried aloud in the streets, and, with a superb assertion of its powers, annulled the *status quo*.

In that moment Liberalism threw up its hands. In its belligerent it foresaw its victor; for a thing which has been predicated as dead, in every revelation of vigor becomes a Nemesis. Liberalism, in its very babyhood, had seemed to strangle its adversary.

[1] Because tactically faulty. [2] *L'Adriatico.* [3] Clerical or Catholic.

In its youth it had killed the Nemean lion. It had no stomach for its other labors. It was prematurely old; more than all else, it was prematurely rotten. Its adventures had proved failures, its heroes criminals, its statesmen thieves. It had spent its strength, wasted all its unlovely vigor, after it had let the reins loose upon the neck of its lusts. Had it found no enemy, its manhood and its virtue would have had to suffice in absence of a competitor; but here was an enemy which was beyond all question indomitable, for had it not survived wounds more than mortal?

These feelings were the feelings of all. The perception that the Catholics were the healthiest social, moral and political elements in the nation sunk gradually into the minds of the majority of their enemies. Its impression is deepening daily, and must logically prepare the way for the advent of the Papal party to public life and to political power. Political Liberalism is corrupt; they are incorrupt. It is disillusioned; they are enthusiastic. It is nerveless; they are vigorous. It has seen its ideals vanish and its works wither; they have a glorious ideality and the sanction of success. It has failed; they hold the promise of victory.

The reasons are not far to seek. Catholicism has been purified in castigation. Liberalism has been debauched in victory. The nation seemed[1] to be Liberal, and Liberalism, in fulfilment of splendid promises, gave it loss and disappointment. The Italians who clamored for unity, who fought for it and who effected it, were mostly *doctrinaries*. But they were few. Persuasion had never come to the rest. Every serious calamity is fatal to such a party, and the moral and material depression which is the burden of every description of the country represents a serious calamity.

With the Catholics the happy reverse is the case. They owe their existence as a party to their obedience in a dogmatic religion. That obedience involves the love of and the cherishing of patriotism for the country in which the Government of that Church is placed. They are patriotic Italians for the same cause for which they are fervent Catholics. They have a positive and reconstructive policy; their only negative policy must be reduced to the removal of a perennial fountain of discord. They are not necessarily monarchical or anti-Monarchical, Republican or anti-Republican; consequently, with the fulness of their national creed, the efficacy of their willingness, the experimented and acknowledged capacity of their administration, they combine a consummate adaptability to the needs of the State. In a soundly-minded and moderate people, such as the Italian is, it is impossible that such a party

[1] Seemed, but was not, since the unorganized Catholic body was always powerful numerically. The policy of total abstention, both active and passive, from the elections made it seem powerless.

should be subjected to exclusion or be permitted to continue in abstention to the damage of the State. The result, if not the price, of their co-operation must be some one of those reasonable and satisfactory compromises which are suggested by the situation.

Second in prominence to the religious question only, in so far as an issue out of the present situation is to be sought, is the social question. The social question is the source and summary of all the political questions which affect the situation. Alone, or in conjunction with the religious, the social question may become a vital national issue of the highest emergency. It is so, potentially, even now. Were it to be brought into such operation, the decision concerning all the complex embarrassments presented would chiefly lie with the middle class. In a State which is made hyper-nervous by permanent intestinal disorder the danger of being confronted with a serious social question would be very great, even if the social evils were not in part derived from the discord itself. In the one case that discord might become the ready occasion, in the other it might become the natural cause, of conflict. And here it is obviously sufficient for a remedying of the Papal complaint that the power which stands constituted as its official and capital enemy should endure notable embarrassments, not to say great damage or total extinction, since in a period of upheaval or anarchy the Papacy would possess a following not only more numerous than the anarchical faction, but efficiently equipped for active interference on its behalf. Thus, if the enemy of the actually-existing social order were to overpower its defenders, that calamity would be more than half a victory for the Papal claim to independence, since the unsuccess of all the protestations made on its behalf has been due to the presence of a united and hostile power enjoying respect, receiving loyalty, guaranteeing order and satisfying the principal material needs of the nation, to which last, as has been said, spiritual needs appear secondary, except in a period of unusual religious fervor. The supposition of an organized *Commune* in Italy must be put aside as being at least equally impossible with that of a permanent state of chaos anywhere else. The Republican party, represented in the Chamber by less than a tenth of the deputies, could only give a realization to its ideals in the case of a rallying to it of the majority or the exercise of tyrannical and military methods. But the Italian troops are not Pretorian Guards, nor ever National Guards, while the odd forty in every hundred of the Italian electors whom the Pope holds in restraint could be at once marshalled to wield, or to acquire, the balance of power. It may well be doubted if the devoted Italian Catholics of to-day are timorous; if they are, then it only remains to be said that in a crisis cowardice often prompts, as courage would.

In its relation to the independence of the Roman Pontificate, the social question, like the political question, would turn upon a choice between the two powers—that of the Vatican and that of the Quirinal. The latter has a double foe—the Vatican and Extreme Liberalism and Anarchism in all their modifications. These extreme parties are opposed to it as the constituted and Monarchical authority. The Vatican is opposed to it as the unrelenting occupant of its own necessary safeguards of every condition of vital independence. So long as the Vatican maintains this discord it enjoys a relative immunity from the assaults of the Extremists, for the double reason that it is not a constituted authority and that it is in formal antagonism to the constituted authority, while its feud might suggest itself as a lever to be used against the State. As the vanquished party and as a depressed influence the Vatican enjoys the right, just as it is forced into the necessity, of utilizing the difficulties of the Monarchy on its own behalf. The interests of the universal Church would certainly induce it, in favorable contingencies, to abandon its passive attitude. Regard for the popular good would be the last measure to its policy of vindication.[1]

Apart from such forced abandonment of its passive policy as the Vatican would be brought to in a crisis, whether that crisis be of the graver or less grave sort, there exist material causes which might dispose the middle class to unite with, or to incline towards, the Papacy as the only, or the only available, influence offering or making possible a panacea to the evils of the State, to the unbearable military and naval equipments, to the stagnation of industry, trade and commerce, and to the general impoverishment.

It is unnecessary to crowd the narrow limits of a review article with elaborate proofs of this. The cases are suggested by a consideration of the posture of parties and of the conditions of the country. Thus, if Italy were to abandon her ambition to maintain a vast war establishment which has served for scarcely a single positive purpose during the space of a generation,[2] and of which, besides ambition, there exists for cause only the Papal difficulty, she could easily recover that prosperity which is proper to her and create other safeguards for her honor and integrity. Though not a wealthy country, she is endowed with sufficient means to support a far larger population than she at present holds. She is op-

[1] Some have talked and written about an alliance between the Vatican and the Republican and some of the other extreme parties. The matter is not worth discussing in theory or as matter of present policy. As one of preparation, the policy would not be very unnatural. A temporary alliance to overthrow the Monarchy would be natural.

[2] It is no consolation to the people who suffer *pellagra* from the want of salt to know that Italy has been entrusted with the command in Crete. Indeed, this command was given on account of her relative unimportance.

pressed and famished almost solely by this military establishment. Incidental financial depressions and incidental ruptures of treaties, such as that of the commercial treaty with France, may be provided against, and, even when past, are reparable or irreparable, because accidental. It has been too freely denied that the Italians nourished political ambitions, but the fruitlessness of these ambitions and the inadequacy of their means, have convinced them that a curtailment of this expenditure and a devolution of the care and wealth expended on them to internal prosperity belong to the wisest policy, and constitute the only policy capable of securely maintaining prosperity. Therefore, the necessity of adjusting or of oppressing the Papal claims is the only remaining cause for the enterprise. That enterprise ended, the troubles of Italy would have no further reason for existence.

In the case of a practical people, and the Italians are such, it is hardly necessary to illustrate the variety of circumstances which may arise in which they would be brought to settle the question which the Papacy has never prejudiced in their eyes by the invoking of foreign aid, by the active fomenting of discord, or by the maintaining of even a semblance of faction at home. Thus we have spoken throughout of hypotheses of cases which we have described as potential. It should be observed, however, that the necessity of adjusting the Papal claims is so real that this conditional description is only true when taken in connection with all the influences which make its solution to be within the proximate possibilities, within the more distant probabilities, or within the remote certainties. If these claims have such qualities, it must be difficult to conceive why the chances should not be more mature and near to accomplishment, and why, in view of their extreme naturalness, we do not esteem their adjustment as an event which is not only certain but among the certainties of the morrow. To this it may be answered that a thing which is possible, and which might receive a determining cause within ten years, may be prevented from realization for a hundred years by some of those complex conditions which, taken as a whole, make its eventual solution both certain and subject to chance. We will try and explain this by a consideration of the general situation in Italy and of the particular development which is, if we mistake not, bearing the Roman question towards a certain but perhaps far-removed finality of solution.

Some of these necessary motive-causes would be violent if brought into action now, and violence is not a characteristic of the mother-land of humanism. Reliance, we have said, may be placed upon the middle class of Italians, not less for sobriety of political judgment than for stability of economic tenure. These, their

characteristics, are long-standing and well-known, and they may be traced backwards to the middle classes of the mediæval republics, where a *bourgeoisie* came into existence and first assumed the rôle of an important social factor. The Italians gave the type which modern Europe has copied, and, if they have changed since they created the type, they have changed by reason of the increase rather than of the decrease of the milder characteristics.[1] They became, first, less barbarous; then more intensely humane. The middle class of Italians, though neither highly educated nor very arid of culture, are humane, not less by reason of historic conditions and of the influences of environment than from natural instinct.[2] To be humane and to be still *bourgeois* is to repel violence, and to excel in that common-sense which is the distinctive quality of "men of the world" and *hommes d' affaires* in the court, the camp and the cabinet. If the Italian *bourgeois* seek his national ancestry he will find its fullest types in the merchants of Genoa and Venice, which republics, like modern England, not only spread a network of commerce over sea and land, but absorbed the carrying-trade of the world and exercised supremacy on the sea; in the financiers of Florence who supplied "the sinews of war" to the third Edward; and, in general, in the titled and untitled burgesses of "the hundred cities."[3] More acumen may have been exhibited at Genoa, more craftiness may have been displayed at Venice, more success may have been reached at Florence. Both qualities were cultivated, and success was attained; and all three tended to create an aversion to war at a time when the people of France, Germany and England were making of the playthings of chivalry the business of their lives, and its bloodier exercises the purpose of their nationhood. The Italian burgess came early to abhor blood, and it would not be difficult to show that the conciliatory disposition and the practice which make the very soul of diplomacy were by him early acquired as a virtue and long retained as a habit.[4] From being a habit they passed to be a second nature.

---

[1] Consequently much of the description in Lord Macaulay's *Essay on Macchiavelli* would not be true in the present day.

[2] Ladies from abroad invariably observe how kindly they treat their cats, yet I have never noticed a fondness for cats. These domestic queens are neither *ill-treated* nor *fondled*.

[3] The privileges and characteristics of the burgesses belong to the middling orders of the present day. It is with these middling orders that we are concerned. The *haute bourgeoisie* is not very clearly distinguished in all its points from the aristocracy, but the *petite bourgeoisie*, with its *locupletes* and *assidui*, is contradistinguished from those who are literally *proletarii*.

[4] The remembrance of the *bravi* and of the inhuman methods of "the age of despots" should not be referred to the entire Italian history of the Middle Ages. This is not the place to show how limited by time, place and other circumstances such

So moderate is the temperament of the people in general that Italy is the only European country which has never experienced the horrors of a religious war, though it has been the most tormented of all by civil wars and most frequently embroiled in other wars unconnected with religion;[1] though it has been the seat of the Popes, and has witnessed the rise and progress of the faction of Arnold of Brescia, the crusading of Frederick II.,[2] the incursions of foreign and unorthodox invaders, the possession of North and Northeastern Italy by the Albigensian heresy, and the violence of more than a score of Papal schisms.[3] The present relations of courteous hostility observed by the two powers in Rome are due to these dispositions as well as to the conviction of the uselessness of any other method, and to the common though differently shared hope that such a course may prepare the way for peace, while removing the causes of unnecessary friction without bringing detriment to the rights of either.

These conditions of feeling and of policy[4] naturally suggest that they may be not only the best expedient for the moment, but the surest preparation for future peace. And, indeed, the policy of patient waiting which the Vatican has taken up, and which Leo XIII. has repeatedly asserted to be his only policy would at first blush seem to indicate that the wisdom of the Roman See regards the settlement as both necessary and as necessarily to come from Italy itself, saving always such abrupt or violent chances as have been mentioned.[5]

Great caution is required in approaching this portion of our

---

practices were. Admitting, however, for sake of argument, their universal presence in mediæval Italy, it would be quite sufficient for our present purpose to point out that while the modern centuries have obliterated every vestige of such practices in the Italian *bourgeoisie*, the character of the latter has been extremely mollified, while retaining much of shrewdness and of that spirit of negotiation which is the middle-class adaptation of diplomacy.

[1] In such several instance it has abandoned the pursuit of peace only at the dictates of temporal interest.

[2] The Lombard League may suggest a contradiction of this. But Alexander III. acted then as Julius II. did later, when he merited to be saluted as *Italiæ Liberator*.

[3] Intrusions of anti-Popes. In all, twenty-six at least, from that of Novatian in 254 to the last of all in 1439.

[4] I have noticed that Roman ecclesiastical dignitaries dislike the word *policy* used of the Pope's course of action. We accept the repudiation, but retain the word because of its susceptibility of a finer and purer meaning than it generally receives.

[5] The present Pope may be supposed to have had these changes in view when, on December 27, 1896, he said to the veterans of the disbanded army of 1870 that from Canada, from Ireland, from Belgium, from France and from other countries filial offers of (military) service had come with great frequency. He had replied that he was thankful, and that he hoped the time would soon come when he would again see himself surrounded by so many faithful and dearly-beloved sons. I have commented upon the import and importance of this declaration of His Holiness in *The Tablet*, January, 9, 1897.

theme. We will advance, therefore, by the safest method, that of exclusion.

The Pope may, in the mind of Catholics, be delivered, to-morrow or the day after to-morrow, out of the *impasse* by an intervention of Heaven ordering events wonderfully and manifestly, or by the more natural medium of foreign political interference. The first matter lies beyond calculation. The second medium must be either pacific or not.

With this, as a remote and not impossible contingency, must be coupled another, viz., that the entire Papal dominion as it was before 1840 or an even more extensive territory or power, may pass from the spoiler to the despoiled. Such are ever the chances of spoils. The *Osservatore Romano* believes that those who are unwilling to sacrifice something may lose everything.[1] It might be to the interest of some third person, by the use of positive or negative means, to make possible or to allow an entire restoration to be made, but the stability of the present European settlement and the aversion to war tend to favor consolidation in Italy, and to shut off occasions. General Boulanger dreamed, or said he dreamed, of an Italian Federal Republic with the Pope at its head. It is difficult, however, to see what active interest the European States can have in showing aversion towards Italy or favor towards the Papacy. Yet, without such interest, only the abstract justice of the case could induce them to intervene. Without active intervention no solution can be proposed with effect from abroad. The *status quo* meets as many exigencies as busied and worried chancelleries can bother about. The same rule is applied at Crete, at Constantinople, and in what is called Armenia. Only Ecuador protested against the capture of Rome in 1870, and Ecuador has gone back from what it became under Garcia Moreno, and could effect nothing if it had not. A foreign intervention might occur without a war. Its chances, however, are about proportionate to, though partly distinct from, those of a war. There has been an unceasing and prurient potentiality for war in Europe since the year which saw the downfall of the Papal dominion. War might have been almost at any hour; at some hours it has seemed about to burst out; but the crises have all passed, leaving behind them only a confirmation of peace and every sentiment and moral circumstance which make war more difficult. The material conditions tend to produce war; the moral conditions hold them in check. The reverse is verified in Italy. The necessity which is

[1] *I.e.*, The Italian Monarch. I repeated this statement to the late Cardinal Galimberti. He qualified it as rubbish. There is every reason, however, to estimate it as it is here estimated.

potential for solution is a moral one. The material adjustment is its restraint. The Roman Question might have been settled at any time; at some times its settlement[1] seemed to be at hand, but each propitious occasion has followed the other out of the field of pressing questions, making a settlement by means of foreign intervention, pacific or not, more and more difficult.

In its present form the feud between the Monarchy and the Papacy is, *in se*, internecine, and it is among the risks of such a feud that one or other of the combatants should in a moment of extreme adversity find himself between the devil and the deep sea. In an hour of success the Papacy might wish to secure a future friend by saving the Monarchy, but it might be too costly for it to attempt such a redemption. The eventuality of the Popes being enabled to entirely recuperate either all their patrimony,[2] or a wider sovereignty still, or a position of greater political eminence than they formerly filled, must be considered as chimerical only in so much as the erection of Prussian ascendency over Germany seemed chimerical in 1808. There is a case nearer home. The Italy of to-day has been well described as having issued out of the stuff that dreams are made of.[3] Its unity has been achieved in obedience to precepts and ideals which were only the logical sequence of dreams. The idea of independence in unity seemed, within the memory of men still living, to be a dream—*parevano sogni.* What has been created out of the figments of dreams in fifty years is capable of being easily modified in the strangest and most dream-like way. The great lesson of the situation is the almost unlimited possibility of unmaking and making in politics. Consequently, in the worst of all hypotheses, the supreme, the inevitable, the permanent must prevail over everything less than itself. Against such imperious necessity there are no barriers, just as there are no obstructive laws. The false and the unreal must die; but is not the situation of to-day the most anomalous of unreal and false situations? The degree of darkness and uncertainty existing before change is the measure of the prizes to be taken in the effecting of change.

The estimate of the situation thus presented suggests a natural question to the faithful: *Why not propose a plan of conciliation?* To this question comes the serene answer: *It is not for us to propose a compromise or the terms of agreement. The question has not been raised on the other side. The Pope may have terms to offer if*

[1] At the time of the Tosti brôchure; again, and in a different way, at the time of the Giordano Bruno commemoration.

[2] This word, now used descriptively, should be clearly distinguished from the patrimony of St. Peter.

[3] *L'Illustrazione Italiana*, number for September 20, 1895.

the question were raised in a formal and appropriate manner. And, in truth, it would not be a part of wisdom to propose a compromise unasked. No such offer would receive other than hostile reception, and the hope of an effectual and satisfactory solution might suffer.

Every probable indication goes to show that the Holy See cherishes, not ambitions, but conciliatory dispositions, though the Pope, who is the only arbiter of the situation, keeps his own secret. No pronouncement has ever come from the Vatican. It has formulated no demand, because the recognition of its rights has never been diplomatically proposed. But it has given a negative measure, and has thus far afforded an insight into its views. It renounces nothing so long as nothing is offered, but at the same time the Pope's claims have been indicated in such terms as these, and in terms still less vague:

"It was a most singular privilege and great fortune for our country to be chosen from among so many others as the guardian of the Apostolic Chair, and every page of its history attests what an abundance of benefits and what an increase of glory were continually derived from the immediate care of the Roman Pontificate. Has the nature of this last changed or has its power weakened? Human things change, but the power for good which is in the supreme ruler of the Church is from God and is unchanging; but with this difference, that being created to last throughout all ages, it follows with loving vigilance the path of humanity, nor does it refuse, as its detractors imagine, to adapt itself as far as possible to the reasonable needs of the times. If listening docilely, the Italians would have recourse to their ancient traditions and to the knowledge of their true interests whence to draw the courage to cast off the Masonic yoke, we would open our heart to the most agreeable hopes for this dearly-beloved Italian land; but if the opposite be the case, we regret to say that we can foresee nothing but new perils and greater disasters.[1]

The terms of compromise seemingly indicated may be classified in two divisions. The first would include the concession of Rome and its natural territory. The second would include larger concessions, or, rather, casualties.

There is good reason to believe that, if sufficient guarantees were forthcoming, the Vatican would entertain proposals of either class without difficulty and accept them in a definitive settlement.

It is true that when in possession of a restricted territory, such as that which it possessed in 1867, the Vatican was not satisfied. But that territory was hourly threatened, and Rome had been declared the capital of Italy in the Parliament sitting at Florence. After a settlement every such minatory attitude would cease, and the theoretic desirability of having the capital in Rome would be renounced. Three proofs may be given of the possibility of effecting a compromise on such a basis. The one is certain, the other is probable, the third is drawn from authority. First, the

[1] Letter to the Cardinal Secretary of State, October 8, 1895.

famous *Ransom of Rome* scheme, proposed in *The Daily Telegraph*, of London, on September 16, 1895, which was inspired in accordance with the sentiments, and drawn up at the dictation, of staunch friends of the Holy See.[1] That scheme proposed that:

"The Italian post and telegraph, the railways, and certain other services might run through Rome and the reduced Papal State would be matter for arrangement and mutual advantage. That the interest on the floating debt of Italy should be reduced from 574 millions to 349 millions of lire—in other words, that a permanent relief of 225 millions of lire should be effected—would bring substantial relief to the whole population of Italy."

It concluded thus:

"The problem is to find a solution and a remedy. There are not wanting well-wishers of the Kingdom of Italy and of the Papacy who profess to see in the present dead-lock the elements of a final solution of this complicated question so thorough and complete as, if rightly used, to promise a new point of happy departure in the history of the Peninsula. The kingdom is stifled under the double incubus of her financial difficulties and the ever-threatening Roman Question. *Rome demands certain temporal guarantees as essential to the life and action of her unique religious institutions, whose influence and authority are recognized from Berlin to Washington, from Lisbon to Japan, and to Egypt.* What if a scheme could be devised by means of which each should supply to the other what is lacking? Such an hypothesis may at first sight appear extravagant and impossible. As a matter of fact, it is under serious consideration. Nothing less is proposed than that the Catholic countries and peoples of the world should combine to *ransom Rome.* To those familiar with the organization and working of the Roman Catholic communion, and with the intensity of the desire which animates the Catholic Church to secure the perfect independence of its Spiritual Head, it would not be difficult to believe that, the scheme once set on foot, a large sum of money may be collected and placed in the hands of Leo XIII. The Pontiff, with £200,000,000 at his disposal, would have it in his power to deal with the distracted and bankrupt Government of the Italian King more effectively than at present. It would rest with the Pope to meet the Government with proposals that might save the Italian Kingdom, reinstate its exchequer, restore peace, unity and prosperity to Italy. And if it should turn out that, by some singular obliquity of mental vision, the Italian Government should fail to come to fair and honorable terms with the Pontiff, the latter might feel justified in withdrawing from Rome and establishing himself or a period elsewhere, in a position of vantage other than the Vatican, while there would be withdrawn from Rome at the same time that immense sum which is annually brought by the Catholics of the world to the Eternal City, and is there expended."

Secondly: In the spring of 1893, the learned Abbot Tosti, a custodian of the Vatican Library, proposed a plan for the restitution to the Papacy of Rome and a diminutive adjunct of the territory surrounding it. There is a strong belief in Rome that, though he may have exceeded his authority, he was empowered to act, and on a not altogether different basis.

Thirdly: A member of the Sacred College expressed himself as follows in terms which are certainly not unusual in that sphere:[2]

[1] I may be excused from offering a public proof of a private matter which belongs to my certain knowledge.

[2] Printed in *The Catholic Standard and Times*, February 13, 1897. The Cardinal

"Any one of a hundred possible chances would, I believe, be sufficient to secure those assurances and to create that state of independence. In one hypothesis the first step might suffice. That first step would be the removal of the court and its dependent administrative bodies to Florence or some other city. No express renunciation of sovereignty would be necessary. Rome might then be Italian or non-Italian; Italian and at the same time not Italian, I repeat; it could enjoy something similar to the condition of a Hanseatic city. The rest of the difficulty would adjust itself by the natural procedure of events and by the inevitable developments of the causes so created and set in action; both of which—the events and the developments—would be promoted in the proper way by the good dispositions of the people and by the very necessity of conciliation, a necessity which is innate in the nature of things, as these are and must be in Italy. But a sovereign—ah, there is the rub!—a sovereign is and must always be a symbol. Were the Pope to be confronted in the streets of Rome by the President of a Republic which included Rome in its dominions, he might pass him by without suffering in prestige. He would inevitably overshadow the transient head of a Republican State by the majesty of his personally-embodied sovereignty. A King, with his court, is quite another thing. His person is a contrast and his name a rallying cry. Two embodied sovereignties, the persons, I mean, of two sovereigns, cannot meet in the same city, just as their respective powers cannot be exercised over the same field. In either case there must be collision and conflict, in which the one or the other royal person will undergo obscuration. Therefore the power of one must be restrained—as it is at present—to avoid difficulties. Over one and the same city or region the two jurisdictions cannot be wielded, and as little can the persons of the two sovereigns be brought into contact. Were they brought into contact, there would be a reflection upon their respective personalities and estates. They would obfuscate and jostle each other, or the one the other. This would naturally generate clearly-marked popular preferences and accentuated civil discords, so that even the common and elementary interests of the public order would be jeopardized. A Pope and a King cannot be equal. Neither can they permit themselves to be less than equal. This is the kernel of the present difficulty in Rome. Hence the means of solution which I have suggested.

And outside of Rome! Personally I believe that Rome, the *Civitas Romana*, the Roman city and its natural environment, would, in the case of a consideration being made, become the natural and the principal, possibly also the exclusive, subject of an arrangement. The Pope, in his wisdom, might see fit to sacrifice something, more or less, for the permanent and general good of the Church. We do not ask for what is impossible, just as we do not lament the inevitable. The necessity—the ethical necessity, so to call it—of territorial independence for the Papacy is this: That the acts and utterances of every Pope should be free even from the suspicion of partiality; that France and Germany, that Austria and England, that Spain and America, that every nation, the greatest and the smallest alike, should know that in whatever the ruler of the Church does or says he is not actuated directly or indirectly by a desire to subserve the good pleasure or to avoid the displeasure of Italy; that he should not even seem to abide in the danger of suffering intimidation or of falling into subservience."

In any similar solution, agreement might be made that the defence of Rome should remain in part at least the care of Italy, that its municipality should enjoy autonomy, that the Pope should exercise an absolute, as well as suspensive, veto on every measure. All similar points would be merely incidental to the cardinal fact and theory that the Pope should be sovereign. He could be ex-

---

has no political *color* of any exceptional kind. Hence his opinions may be regarded as normal, though personal.

onerated from the odious duties of a civil ruler, such as would be the signing of death-warrants, the repressing of disorder, the interfering with the *police*, the even indirect gathering of taxes and all those functions of a supreme ruler least grateful to the Head of the Church. He should be left the supreme control.

In his good pleasure the Pope might condescend to accept such a situation which, from the knowledge of the Roman question in the possession of the public, seems to be lacking in no essential element. These conditions are merely material. The spirit of conciliation is everything. If regard be had to the grounds upon which the Papal demands are made, it is clear that a sincere spirit of conciliation, a true desire for peace on the part of official Italy, would make a settlement easy. Only a minimum of sacrifice would be requisite. Any proposals, even of such limited nature as those which have been considered, if formally made and if informed by the spirit proper to them, would afford a quick passage to the ideal objects which now, daily, more and more, satisfy the cravings of the Italians, peace and prosperity at home; protection and honor abroad. Otherwise, every effort is vain.

The postulate of every inquiry which is not a mere waste of time, and the indispensable preliminary of every attempt at adjustment which is not a mere piece of futility,[1] is this: that the Roman See will never renounce its asserted right to, or cease to make a demand for, sovereign independence. Were any occupant of the See to make a renunciation, formally or informally, his act would be such a deviation from a policy necessarily immanent in the Pontificate itself as to bear every aspect of an anomaly at the time, and to call for a rectification on the part of his immediate, his earlier or later, successors. The second or third, if not the first, of following Popes would in all probability undo his work, just as Urban V. unsuccessfully, and Gregory XI. successfully, set about replacing the Papal throne in Rome, thus unmaking the change wrought by Clement V. Few Catholics need any ample demonstration of this contention, but for logical completeness it may be well to explain it in some way, since every explanation accepted of the Roman Question is a gain to the cause of universal peace. Let us suppose the Roman Pontiffs of the past to have reared with lofty ambition[2] and to have sustained with shrewed statesmanship a huge fabric of feeble but specious claims[3] affecting dissident churches, heretical bodies and ethnical

[1] Like that of Signor Crispi in 1895. I have described his efforts in *The Catholic World*, February, 1895.

[2] The last account of the commencement of the civil rule of the Papacy is probably that of P. Brunengo, S.J., *Le Origini della Sovranità*, etc.

[3] Not jurisdiction, but overlordship in the middle ages, and pre-eminent dignity and the Apostolic Office unvaryingly.

communities. Such eminence, such cunning, such authority would enable almost every successive autocrat to feel the unrestricted and intangible power embodied in himself, and oblige him to desire that it should be transmitted, if without increase, then at least without diminution, to his successor. Each reign would accumulate new sanction and influence, and enlarge the compelling force by which the princes most separated by character and circumstance would be both enabled and obliged to maintain unimpaired all the seemingly essential traditions of their office, the abandonment or neglect of which would have become equivalent to a nullification of the right to exist. Let us suppose that a long course of centuries[1] had deposited among the strictest of these external traditions one imperative tradition by which these hierarchs were at once put in contact and placed on an equality with the rulers of States—that this adjunct of their power had become its "complexion" in the eyes of all. Now, in this manner, at the lowest estimate, all this must be admitted, universally and with few distinctions. If the dexterity of the Bishops receiving, and not the generosity of the princes donating, created the temporal apanage of the See of Rome, all this is none the less true. Hence it is clear that this body of traditions, once acquired and increased, should remain, against every proof of adversity, a vital law. Whatever may be the opinion entertained about the principality of the Popes, as existing before 1870, or as factitiously existent since that date, there are countless irrefragable testimonies to show that its possession and re-acquisition have become mutually related and counter-balancing: the cardinal principles in an absolutely immutable policy. There is an entire literature on the subject, a literature which is chiefly modern,[2] and which shows that abandonment is not less out of the question now than formerly. And if not now, then at what time? If not in 1800, in 1848–49, in 1870, in 1878, then why in 1897, in 1997, in 2297? The far-reaching effects of such a policy must be estimated by the endurance of which the Papacy gives promise.

Nor is it less rational to regard this permanent influence, and all the ramifications of helping influences which it creates and centres about itself, and all the opportunities which it makes, or of which

[1] From 800 to 1870 is a long cry, yet these dates form the limits of the minimum period within which the temporal sovereignty of the Popes must be placed.

[2] The library of the late Cardinal Howard, now a part of the English College Library at Rome, contains whole shelves of this literature, yet the collection was very incomplete at the time of his departure from Rome in 1881, and it still more incomplete at the present date. The late Cardinal Galimberti had also a library of the same kind. He himself disclosed to the present writer his authorship of one of the best of the countless monographs. It was entitled, *La Situation du Pape*, etc. It is now, unfortunately, out of print.

it avails itself, as amounting to a cause, of which the corresponding effect should be the partial or total attainment of the aim so constantly held in view.

The most superficial survey of the vicissitudes of States shows that the conduct either of ordinary affairs or of extraordinary events does not move along straight but deviating courses; that the solidly-founded internal and external prosperity of a country, when unsustained by principles which make for enduring vitality, lapses into decrepitude or is replaced by its opposite, or is lost in a dissolution, in a moral or material absorption, before the advance of stronger influences. The imperial power of Charles V. and Philip II., although in the secret consciousness of those monarchs suspicious and unsatisfactory, assuredly offered promises of resistance to decay, and consequently of permanence, not inferior to those offered by the Italian Monarchy of Victor Emannel II. or Humbert I. The power of Louis XIV. disappeared by reason of another and a different cause, which was nevertheless only the operation of an intrinsic principle of unhealthiness.

But the case of such States which secrete a mortal virus, or hold within them the canker of some hurtful elements, such as were the Empire of Spain and the Kingdom of the *Grand Monarque*, are perhaps exceptional, because exaggerated instances. Independently of such causes of decay (if it be not allowed that Italy possesses such a one in its feud with the Church), sovereignties and States decline for the simple reason that if they do not grow they must diminish, since all permanence, or even continuance, presupposes progress. Growth is the inevitable result of healthful life, and prosperity is the inevitable result of growth. There is no such thing as long existence with stagnation; and existence implies progression, and progression is advancement towards ruin or success. Italy is retrenching her colony and her expenses, and her progression has not been one of advance towards prosperity.

Further, according to a metaphor of a familiar sort, States are periodically being swept by movements favorable and unfavorable They must either breast these, and rise with them, or succumb before them. Each several movement may advance or recede irregularly, but there is always a movement in course; generally there are more movements than one. These various movements are the test of vitality to States, crucial experiments of their fruitfulness, of their constitution, of their capability for existence. Italy is being visited by more than one such movement now. Some of these have entered from abroad, while others have sprung up in the country itself. These last are generally more energetic, more sudden and more irresistible, by reason of the contracted space in which they act, of the limitations against their venting

themselves by expansion, and also, and principally, by reason of their native character. Not a few of these, when in action, are like to whirlwhinds. They envelop the strongholds of national power, and in the climax of their force close around them in a fatal embrace. Their power is either reformative or destructive, seldom reconstructive. If the sullen combined movement formed out of the social grievances and the religious reaction acquire such strength in Italy, the day of its spent fury will see a surviving power concentrated, strengthful, and healthy. That power will be the Vatican.

Half the hopes of success which belong to a fallen dynasty or a displaced form of government are contained in the working of such causes as these which have been variously enumerated. But they are chiefly extraneous, exist chiefly apart from the old ideals and the old dynasty. The other hopes—the lesser half, in so far, that is, as they are considered in relation to actuality—reside in the power of permanence, the solidity, the pliability and the general excellence of the cause and its representatives. Occasionally a restoration is made as the mere effect of a reaction; not so much as the result of choice as of avoidance, less from any act of acceptance than from one of declination. Even the Liberals would, in given circumstances, join in such a seeming revulsion.

All the best conditions for a restoration of the Roman Pontificate to the status which it formerly possessed are present both as inherent in the institution itself and as attaching to the methods of restoration which it has preferred to facilitate. This restoration would be bloodless and inexpensive, and just as it would not occasion bloodshed or expenditure, so it would have place, accompanied by a reasonable hope that both the evils of bloodshed and of extravagance would be definitively made impossible, or would at least be removed very far away in the future. The third great evil of a restoration, humiliation, would also be absent, for the Papacy has sedulously avoided everything which could make the Italian people feel that their acceptance of a compromise was shameful, or which could induce the Roman people to regard the new sovereignty imposed upon them as a disgrace. The fourth circumstance which would make a restoration not only penal but noxious would be also wanting, since the presence of the Popeking and his favor, earnestly promised and strenuously exerted, would be the most efficient guarantee for the desired peace and prosperity at home and the somewhat less desirable protection and respect abroad.

Italy is being traversed by movements such as these: of repudiation, of disgust, of reaction, all of them tending in the direction

of peace with the Roman See. In so far, however, as this is affected, there still remains one great dike against which the reflowing waters have lapped querulously—the ideality of Rome, the national capital. We will conclude this sketch of dim and rough outlines, enclosing great and clearly-evidenced truths, by quoting another article which appeared during its preparation:

"Raffaele Cadorna. He had passed into the domain of history so long ago that his name, arising in a formal fashion once a year because of its union with a date which was only eloquent in mournfulness, seemed like the name of a man associated with other times. He had passed into history, and he seemed to have nothing in common with the present life of Italy. Military experts have repeatedly, and will yet again, criticise from the soldier's standpoint the expedition of 1870. But not by reason of its imperfections was the result so pitiable; political criticism has demonstrated, and, during the last quarter of a century, has continually demonstrated, that the national error was far more serious than the military error. The governors of Rome were crushed beneath the weight of a great burden, against which was required far more life than they possessed to struggle successfully. So, before the African fiasco, came the great failure of the new Italy in Rome itself. This failure was recognized on the part of all the people, but those few who displayed sufficient intelligence to think, or sufficient will to act, were combated as criminals. They were vanquished. It seemed to be political heresy to wish even to unite in one expression the homage paid to the Liberator King, and the unity of which he had been the instrument. Italy remained encamped in a Rome where both intelligence and fortune suffered shipwreck, and seemed to seek in vain at home and abroad her *raison d'être*. In truth there was no properly directed force, or any pretensions to progress or to a fruitful activity. In the new economy of humanity it was simple pleonasm. Consequently Rome was not only useless, but hurtful. The Italians would have been so willingly contented in that leaden mediocrity which escapes the attention and cupidity of others, would so willingly have settled down to vegetate, had not the mere name of a grand historic figure indisposed them to do so. Hence irritation against Rome filled their souls, and more than once, in the Parliament which represented them so faithfully, Italy expressed it, amidst the wordy rhetoric with which it was desired to mask it, for such sufficed to people who had not then the courage of sincerity. That irritation grows and becomes venomous in the consciousness that the error is irremediable; that, once entered into Rome, Italy can only issue therefrom dead; worse—that it would have been dead had it not entered there. She remains there with a complacency like to that of him who invented the fatal bull and was imprisoned in it the first by Phalaris. But with this difference, that the torment is only tedium; the tedium of small men confronted with great things. But how to ostracise Rome? Like the love in the popular song, Rome is a chain, a chain which breaks not."[1]

The least complete understanding of the situation in Italy supplies a clear light to the intelligence of this article. It is the key to the situation. Before its acquisition Rome was asseverated to be a moral, intellectual and national necessity. Therefore every reluctance was overcome, and Italy allowed herself to be dragged thither. Now that she has made experience of it, she has given us her verdict on a most solemn and most particular occasion,

[1] This is a reproduction of an abbreviated translation which I drew up, and which appeared in *The Irish Catholic* of February 27, 1897.

using as her mouthpiece her greatest journalistic organ, the recognized instrument of an entire warfare waged in a contrary spirit. The avowal is a repudiation. It hardly anticipates history. It is, above all things, exact. Why? Because this is the land of veiled thoughts, covered words and evasive actions. Above all things, it is the country of a puny and servile press. When, therefore, this *magnum organum* of euphemism, which we playfully miscall the *Tribuna*, cancels all its creeds and cries halt, it seems as though the game is up. And so it is.

From this stage of the history of modern Italy the evolution will be more rapid than it has been heretofore. But the event of a solution may be very far off, for the proportion between conviction and action is more unequal to its causes, more thin and weak here than elsewhere, for here thought is often overripe and action still unprepared. No people is so quick to perceive, none so slow to act. But then the Roman Question is a repetend in every phase of the Italian life of the present and of the future. So the *bourgeois* revolution will be more and more undone, consumed in conviction, frittered away in fact, and the marvel of it all to those who stand far off will be how it was done so noiselessly and imperceptibly, and, to those who stand near, how it was done with such clamorous and tedious slowness. The Italian is seldom demonstrative of what is demonstrated to him; only boisterous over things less real.

> His greatness not so much in genius lies
> As in adroitness, when occasions rise,
> Life-long convictions to extemporize.

Thus the very situation contains, conceals, suggests, expounds the solution. Rome is the incurable ill; the peril that passes not away. About it the Papacy is resolute;[1] about all else irresolute or positively amenable to diplomatic overtures. About it Italy is resolute; about all else irresolute or positively amenable. Thus the movements will carry on the germs of solution without giving them much concrete determination. On the eve of settlement the chances may seem but little less obscure than now. But there is a whole phantasmagoria of Guelfic glory luminous out of the past; the sweet effulgence of Silvio Pellico, Gioberti, Manzoni, Rosmini, Ventura; the mellowed splendor of Marcantonio Colonna and Giovan Andrea Doria; the inspiring grandeur of victories like that of Legnano, and of covenants like that of Gontida. The symbol of a perfect and immutable pact of peace and paternity is there; the Papacy, which is the new *Caroccio* to thousands who are convinced when hundreds waver;[2] to the or-

[1] I speak of the sphere of public opinion.

[2] The Pope received 1500 telegrams on the anniversary of the taking of Rome,

ganized skill of the Venetian and Lombard Catholics; to the fervid faith of those of the southern provinces and to the calculating populations of the old State who remember that the failings of the Church's Government were those of kindly ruling. Out of this will come the solution predetermined now by the situation itself. Even without the catastrophe which has followed the enterprise against the Papacy, even without the existence of the social and the endurance of the religious questions, even without the reflowing of thought, the desire of peace and the conciliatory dispositions of almost all, the question were itself soluble by the self-evident and cardinal fact that in Rome are mated in internecine feud the ruler of a newly-fashioned kingdom and the chief of a world-religion which is inured to assault and—divine evidences apart—permanent in vitality, persistent in development, victorious when vanquished, secularly renascent, intangible and indestructible for the very suppleness and spiritual nature of its contexture. To it trial comes as the tessera of excellence, for it has a solidarity which neither the spirit of the age nor the progress of humanity is disposed to end, and which in every other time and place has invariably enabled it to issue out of every duel shattered but impervious, unresisting but indomitable.

WILLIAM J. D. CROKE.

ROME, March 1, 1897.

---

while the King of Italy received 1450; 750 were sent to the Syndic of Rome, and 500 to Crispi.—*The Tablet*, September 28, 1895.

HOW THE TURK CAME TO CONSTANTINOPLE.

THE international tangle now going on over the affairs of the Turkish Empire seems outside the rule of Right and of politics alike. The navies of six nominally Christian nations are gathered in the Ægean Sea in overwhelming force. They are gathered, avowedly, to save a Christian population of several millions from extermination at an irresponsible despots will. Yet they act as if maintenance of the same despot's power was their chief object. The English Parliament and press ring with denunciations of the "unspeakable Turk," but the English navy bombards his Christian foes when they attempt to upset his sanguinary rule. Russia for centuries has claimed to be the natural defender of the Greek Christians against Mahomedan tyrranny, yet Russia to-day menaces the Greek Kingdom with war if she dares to raise her hand against the Sultan. That potentate himself is addressed one day as an irresponsible savage who can only be kept from wholesale murder by the sight of European guns pointed against his palace; the next day he is treated as the head of a civilized nation, whose rights and power must be upheld as a common duty by all other civilized nations. The true position of the Turkish Empire among the nations can best be understood by a brief study of what men the Turks are and how they have come into European lands.

The nations of modern Europe and their descendants on this Continent, however different they may be in laws and language, all belong with one exception to a common stock, and all accept, at least in theory, the law of Christianity as the recognized rule of right human action. In the distant past, forty centuries ago or more, the Aryan race, even then a civilized one, began to move from its original abode in Central Asia to the south and west, and in successive migrations it occupied the whole of Europe, as well as Persia and Hindostan, more than three thousand years ago. Greeks and Latins, Celts, Teutons, Slavs and Scandinavians are all descended from one original race, and still use languages drawn from the primitive Aryan tongue in common with the old Sanscrit of the Indian Brahmins and the Zend of Cyrus and Darius. Even in the early days of Aryan existence as a nation another race different in language, in habits and disposition disputed with it the possession of Central Asia, and finally occupied it after the westward emigration of the Aryans. This was the race known in Persian history as the people of Turan, and in

modern times indiscriminately as Tartars, Turcomans, or Turks. The first name is misleading, as Tartary is the name given to the whole of Central Asia north of the Himalayas and Persia and west of China proper. Its population is nearly equally divided between the Turkish and Mongolian races, each subdivided into many separate tribes, but possessing a common language and race traditions. Both Turcomans and Mongols are despisers of city life and agriculture, and are shepherds and herdsmen by choice, but they are separated by race language and mutual hostility. From the earliest times recorded in history both those wild races have been accustomed to war on their civilized and wealthy neighbors either for conquest or for mere plunder. In cases of the first their custom has been wholly unlike the colonization practiced by the Aryan races. The Mongol or Turkish conqueror of a civilized country has always disdained to adopt its ways, and has remained a foreign ruler amid conquered subjects. When the vigor of the original invaders waned under the influence of luxury and self-indulgence, rule was wrested from them by either their subjects or some fresh body of their own race. The ever-recurring growth of short-lived empires of barbarian conquerors is, indeed, the history of Asia. The Aryans settled in that Continent have been equally subject to such vicissitudes as the other Asiatic races. At the present moment a Mantchu dynasty rules China, a Turcoman family governs Persia, and the name of the "Great Mogul" as titular sovereign of India only became extinct some forty years ago. Four centuries ago a Mongol Khan, with his seat near the Chinese frontier, was the lord paramount of Russia. As far back as the days of Julius Cæsar the Turcoman tribes raised up a rival to Roman power in the Parthian Monarchy which replaced the Greek conquerors of Persia. The ceaseless ebb and flow of power from the civilized to the uncivilized races of Asia is one of the strange facts in the history of the world.

More than two thousand years ago a ruler of the Aryan race, Darius, of Persia, himself a lawgiver and organizer of the then supreme monarchy of the Western world, engraved an imperial edict on the rocks of Behistun, in the upper valley of the Euphrates. It was given in three languages—the Aryan tongue of Persia, the Turanian of his Scythic subjects, and the Semetic of his vassals of Syria and Assyria. The dominion of Western Asia seemed then assured to the race which united military power to a higher civilization; yet the rule of the great Persian monarchs lasted only two centuries, and that of their Greek conquerors, themselves the intellectual leaders among European races, was still shorter. The Turcoman deserts sent forth their swarms again, and a Parthian shepherd took the place of Alexander the Great. The Persians of

Aryan race recovered their independence after three centuries' subjection to this barbarian rule, but only to fall successively under the Semitic Caliphs from the Arabian deserts and the Turkish Sultans from the Eastern steppes. To-day the rule is still with the race which has chosen barbarism rather than civilization for its heritage. Is it possible that history may repeat itself in the future?

As might be expected, the national character of the Turkish race is cast in a different mould from that of the Christian world. It would not be accurate to say it is the same as that of our own Indian tribes, but it certainly is different from what we regard as the ways of civilized men. In every European race the need of general public law to regulate the action of individuals is recognized. Among the Turcoman races the head of the family is practically the supreme law, only subordinate to the will of a stronger individual than himself, be that individual called chief or sultan. Settled abodes, definite daily work, and the combination of such work for a common end, are practically universal. The Tartar despises fixed dwellings and fixed labor alike. In his own land cities are little more than encampments of wandering herdsmen, and whatever energy may be displayed in moments of excitement or under pressure of necessity, steady work for any purpose is regarded as slavish and unworthy of free men. The late Edward O'Donovan, who visited what was practically the latest existing specimen of a Turcoman people in its national condition, gives a lively description of the ways of the "Merv Oasis" in Central Asia, which may illustrate the meaning of the remarks just made. A tribe of herdsmen, numbering probably a quarter of a million of souls, had occupied by force a tract of thirty or forty thousand square miles, and had made good its title by defeating the army of the Shah of Persia forty years before. The Turcoman victors used their victory only to live in barbarian freedom on the site of what had once been a magnificent city. To raid their neighbors, Persian or Turcoman, indifferently, was the regular occupation of the able-bodied men as much as guarding their own herds. Cultivation of the land was only carried on to the extent needed to furnish food to the tribe, and for it a regular force of the men was detailed to attend to the necessary irrigation works, which were the only public works of the community. Weaving and other household manufactures, handed down from the past, were performed by the women of the different families; but so little idea was there of other skilled labor that the artillery captured from the Persians years before, though highly prized as a national defence against outside invaders, was not even mounted or provided with ammunition. The Turcomans knew nothing of such matters as gun-making, though familiar with the actual use

of fire-arms. The nation was divided into a number of clans, each bearing a common name and wearing distinctive marks in their dress and turbans, and there were two hereditary chiefs recognized as the first men of their country; but their power was entirely dependent on their personal energy, and law of any kind was practically unknown. The heads of families met in council at uncertain times, when any matters of general interest had to be decided, and the council ordered at will and left the execution of its orders to the chiefs. During O'Donovan's stay in Merv he was present and took part in one of those national councils, and its action illustrates Turcoman ideas of law and government. Merv was threatened by a Russian invasion, and to avert such an event it was urged that the natives should abandon the habit of plundering their neighbors indiscriminately. An excited citizen arose and demanded how he was to get a living if such a course were adopted. The stranger, whose advice was asked on the matter, suggested that a police force should be established and protection given to caravans and herds for a regular tribute, which would afford better, or at least a more regular, support to the active men than indiscriminate robbery. This proposition was adopted by the assembly, and five hundred heads of families were summarily directed to move their abodes to a central point and hold themselves in readiness for active service at the chief's discretion. A few days later one of the natives lost a flock of sheep in the usual fashion, and the new police were called out and recovered the booty in short order. The chief expressed his satisfaction and proceeded to divide the recovered sheep between the police and himself, leaving the rightful owner in the same position as after the raid. O'Donovan had considerable difficulty in getting him to understand that restoration of the plunder, not its confiscation, was the object of the new organization. It was finally settled that a tax of about a fourth of the value of the sheep should be paid by the owner, and a few hours later the stranger was edified by seeing the robbers and their victim dining together in amity on a mess of sheeps' tails, while the victim boastfully recounted how many sheep he himself had captured in former days by similar proceedings.

The recklessness of human life or suffering among the Merv Turcomans was in strange contrast with the general feeling of humanity towards animals. A native would give himself considerable trouble to bring fresh fodder to his horse or to find a bed for a pet kitten, while the same man in a raid would cut down an unarmed shepherd in sheer brutal exuberance of spirits, or scald a prisoner in a fit of ill-temper or greed. That society should protect its individual members regardless of their personal strength

or influence was an idea which the Turcoman mind seemed never to conceive. If a powerful chief wished to enforce order according to his own ideas, such order would be respected so long as his power lasted; but the people at large, though meeting frequently to provide for the common interests, never conceived the idea of general laws strictly enforced. This frame of mind seems common to the race in every change of abode. The Sultan of Constantinople is familiarly known among his Turkish subjects as the Man-slayer (Hunkiar), because he possesses the privilege of taking human life at will. The administration of justice in the Turkish courts is scarcely different in practice from that of the Merv Khan when appropriating his subjects' stolen sheep. The Ottomans settled for centuries among Christian communities certainly possess more of the material products of civilized industry than their brethren of the Turkestan steppes, but their capacity for supplying such products by their own labor or skill is scarcely greater. Christian or renegade Christian architects and workmen have built the Ottoman mosques and public works, armed their soldiers, built their ships and managed their finances. Without such aid they would be as unable to provide for themselves as the Merv Turcomans were to mount the Persian cannon.

In the all-important matter of religious belief and moral conduct, the difference between the Turkish race and the European world is not less marked than in ideas of human law and society. The late Cardinal Newman, in his lecture on Turkey, styled the Turk the great foe of Christianity in history, and the expression is not too strong. The herdsmen of Tartary, whether Turkoman or Mongol, had originally little definite creed beyond the belief in a Supreme God, and their religious practices were confined to some superstitious incantations.

The Turkomans in the tenth and eleventh centuries learned Mahometanism from the subjects of the Saracen caliphs, and its loose morality and aggressive spirit commended it to their acceptance. The whole race gradually became Mahometan, and when the Saracen Empire was overthrown at Bagdad in the eleventh century the Turkish warriors took the place of the Arabs as the champions of the False Prophet in war against the Christians. The words of the Koran, "Fight on till there is no temptation left to idolatry," and "Heaven is found under the shadow of crossing swords," which gave a religious sanction to the hereditary aggressiveness of the Turcoman freebooters, were enthusiastically received as a divine message, and for centuries they were the rule of life for the Turkish race. The Koran classifies mankind between the House of Islam and the House of War, and war with those outside the first is a holy work in Moslem ideas. This history of

the Ottomans is almost one long war against the nations of the Christian world, and fanaticism has been added to the barbarian contempt for civilization and city dwellers which is almost innate to the Tartar wanderers.

The Turks, then, are foreign to the rest of Europe in a far wider sense than France is foreign to England, or Italy to Germany. Throughout the Christian world, whatever the practice of individuals, a common law of right is recognized by the public conscience. Wanton cruelty, unjust aggression and unbridled sensuality are held to be wrongful things in themselves, but no such feeling seems to exist among the Ottoman race. A Frenchman will condemn the atrocities of the Reign of Terror or the sensuality of Louis XV., or an Englishman will reprobate the butcheries of the Eighth Henry as crimes unworthy of human nature, but no such feeling seems to exist practically among the Turks. The massacre of a Christian population, like the Armenians or Greeks, may be regretted, as the slaughter of battle is, but it is not regarded as criminal before God or man. The Sultan's order to slay is sufficient justification for any slaughter; the Sultan's needs justify any robbery; the Sultan's will legitimatizes any personal vice, in the Turkish mind. Yet Turkey is a European land, its Government is recognized by diplomacy as a European power, and its maintenance is the object of European statesmen at the present moment.

How this barbarian race has come to install itself in the centre of European civilization is worthy of serious reflection. We are used to think that knowledge is power; that advancement in learning, in social life, in science and art gives civilized man an incontestable superiority over barbarian man; yet to-day we see a barbarian race, retaining its barbarism, installed as lord in what was once the very capital of European civilization. The position of the Turks in Constantinople is much the same as if a Sioux tribe should establish itself as master in New York or Chicago and compel the population of those cities to maintain its savage conquerors in the exercise of their native savagery. Strange as is such a supposition, it is no stranger than what has actually occurred. When Constantine founded his new Rome on the shores of the Hellespont the world of Western civilization was united in one mighty state, irresistible in arms abroad and superior in intellectual development and material progress within. The tribes outside the Roman frontier seemed as little formidable to the citizens as the savage tribes of our own continent are to the citizens of New York or Philadelphia. The first Christian emperor surveyed his wide dominion, stretching from the Atlantic to the Euphrates and from the Sahara to the Scotch Highlands, and chose a site for the capital of the civilized world in the most

favored spot of all those lands. It was not an outpost against foreign conquest, but the actual centre of the civilized world that rose on the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Antioch and Alexandria, Athens and Ephesus were then the chief centres of intellectual culture and wealth. Western Asia and Northern Africa were as much a part of the domain of civilization as France or Spain or Italy. The contrast between barbarian and civilized man is the same to-day as in the days of Constantine. The development of civilization, the invention of new arts, the diffusion of knowledge has grown enormously since that date, yet a Tartar Sultan rules to-day in the capital of the Roman Empire. How this has come to pass shall be briefly told.

The rise of Mahometanism in the seventh century built up a mighty power amongst the Semitic Arabs. The new nation conquered the larger part of the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire within a couple of generations, and even besieged its capital for a time. The Saracen Empire, however, had not the stability of the Roman, and after three centuries it crumbled. The hordes of Tartary, in the usual course of Asiatic history, poured into the weakened empire, and finally possessed themselves of much of its territory. These earlier Turks, known as Seljukian, enjoyed their conquests for a few generations, and then they followed the fate of other barbarian conquerors, and their empire broke into a number of petty principalities, scattered through the peninsula of Asia Minor. In the thirteenth century a band of shepherds of the Turkish race, numbering some four hundred and eighty families, moved onwards from the east in search of pasturage for their flocks, and booty, if it came in their way, under the leadership of a chief known as Ertoghrul. They got a grant of land, from the Turkish Sultan of Iconium, on the frontiers of the Greek dominions in Asia Minor, and Ertoghrul there built up a principality and warred with general success on Greek, Turkish and Mongol neighbors. At the death of Ertoghrul, in 1288, his young son, Osman, succeeded to the chieftainship of his clan, and a few years later the family of the Sultans of Iconium died out and Osman assumed the rank of an independent Prince, or Emir. About the year 1300 Asia Minor was then for the greatest part occupied by Turkish tribes who had poured into it and nearly exterminated its original inhabitants under the Seljukian Empire. The Greek Emperor, however, still ruled the coast provinces, and numerous wealthy cities, Smyrna, Brusa, Nicea and Nicomedia, among them, were defended by Greek garrisons. Osman was a bold soldier, and his standard attracted the roving bands of the peninsula to the warfare which he began against the Grecian Empire. The civilized armies of Constanti-

nople were defeated, as the Italians recently were by the Abyssinian warriors, and before his death the Turkish shepherds had made themselves masters of the important city of Brusa. The conqueror did not destroy his conquest; he utilized its resources and the industry of its inhabitants to advance further conquests, and at his death, in 1326, he left a largely increased dominion to his son Orchan. Osman was the first great leader of his tribe, and his name has been adopted by their descendants as their national one. Osmanli, not Turk, is the name by which the conquerors of Constantinople style themselves as a people. Investure with the Sword of Osman is still the ceremony of installation for a legitimate Sultan, and by an almost unparalled case in history the leadership of the Osmanlis has come down for thirty-one generations in direct male descendants from the first Emir.

Orchan continued his father's aggressions on the Greek dominions, but he gave them a far more formidable character. Hitherto the Turkish warriors had only assembled at the call of their Emirs for a single campaign, but Orchan established a standing force of infantry regularly paid and constantly trained to war. Standing armies were unknown in Europe for fully a century later, and this innovation gave enormous military advantages in warfare to the Turkish chieftain. The enrollment of these troops was speedily followed by another measure, which probably contributed more than any other cause to the success in war which so long attended the Ottoman armies. By the conquest of Brusa and other cities a large Christian population had fallen under the dominion of Orchan. In accordance with the law of the Koran, these Christians were forbidden to bear arms, but by the advice of his brother, Allæddin, the Emir devised a barbarous means of utilizing them for his plans of conquest. A tribute of a thousand boys of seven years of age was exacted from the conquered Christians every year, and those children were torn by force from their parents and placed in the charge of Mahometan officers to be reared as Moslems and soldiers. The Christian population thus furnished, involuntarily, the means for further conquests of their fellow-Christians, while their skill and industry supplied the Turkish warriors with the arms and material which themselves were unable to produce. The name of Yeni Tscheri, "new troops," was given by a Moslem dervish to Orchan's troop of Christian boys shortly after their enrollment. The dervish Hadji Beytarch was renowned among the Turks of Asia Minor, and the Emir brought the band of children to his abode for a blessing and a name. The dervisch, according to the Turkish historians, who, it must be said, are more inclined to brevity than to truth, gave both in these words, "The troop thou hast formed shall be known as the New Troop. Their faces shall be

bold, their arms strong, their swords keen, their arrows sharp. They shall be strong in battle, and shall leave the field victors." The name "Yeni Tscheri" thus given to the hapless children doomed to be the instruments of ruin to their own race has been twisted into Janissaries, in the language of Western Europe. Its origin explains one of the most efficient among the causes by which barbarian brutality won the day against enfeebled civilization and degenerate Christians.

The young Turkish Emir did not let his organizing work interrupt the warlike measures which were the congenial work of a chief of Turcomans. With his regular troops he pressed hard on the feeble Greeks. Nicomedia was captured the year of his accession, and Nicea, the greatest Christian city in Asia and the second in importance of the Greek Empire, in 1330. Orchan next employed himself in subjecting the local Turkish chiefs settled around him, and thus uniting under one head the whole Turkish population of Asia Minor. The material resources placed at his disposal by the acquisition of so many Christian cities aided in bringing the Turkish freebooters to acknowledge his dominion and join the Osmanli ranks. Orchan possessed remarkable talents for political organization, and he busied himself for many years in the work of consolidating his barbarian followers into a nation. The Greek Empire, in spite of its superior civilization, was ruled by an opposite spirit, and wasted its strength in political intrigues and civil wars. So low did the honor of its rulers fall that, in 1346, the Emperor Cantacuzene not only invited Orchan to send his barbarian warriors into Europe as a protection against his own subjects but he gave him his daughter in marriage. This baseness was unprofitable alike to the Emperor and his people. The next year several bands of Turkish plunderers crossed the Hellespont and repeated on the soil of Europe the depredations which the Christians of Asia had been so long familiar with. These pillagers were finally exterminated, but they had shown their fellows the road. Palæologus, the son-in-law of Cantacuzene, next raised a rebellion in the empire, and he, too, called in Turkish allies. Solyman Pasha, the eldest son of Orchan, crossed the Hellespont in a Genoese vessel and surprised the Castle of Tzympe, on its European side. The old Emperor, instead of driving off the invaders, asked the help of Orchan against his domestic enemies. Orchan granted the help, and by means of the Greek fleet ten thousand Turks were landed in Europe. They scattered the forces of Palæologus in battle, but in place of returning to Asia when peace was restored, two of the beys seized the important city of Gallipoli. Cantacuzene negotiated in vain for the restoration of Gallipoli, and thus the first Turkish occupation of European lands was made in 1356.

Orchan died two years after the seizure of Gallipoli, but his son Murad, or Amurath, as he is best known in English, lost little time in extending to Europe the warfare which had been hitherto confined to the other continent. He crossed the Hellespont in person in 1360, and for the next twenty-nine years the Balkan peninsula experienced the horrors of Turkish war. Adrianople, the second city of the Greek Empire, was taken in 1361, and Amurath made it the capital of his empire. The Turk was thus established in Europe, and he still remains there in his original barbarism.

Christian Europe in the fourteenth century had fallen far from the spirit which inspired the Crusades two centuries earlier. The old chivalry had become a matter of courtly parades and insolent class-feeling. The boundaries of the various modern nations were all recognized, but between the nations wars and revolutions were everywhere. The year in which the first Turks passed into Europe was the date of the battle of Poiters, which made the King of France a prisoner of England, and for nearly a century later England and France were putting all their energies into warfare between themselves. Germany was divided by internal convulsions, in which the nobles sought to make themselves practically independent, as well as by contests for the imperial crown. Castile was in revolution against King Pedro the Cruel. In Italy the great maritime republics of Venice and Genoa were engaged in the War of Caffa, which nearly brought the former to ruin at one period, and Rome, which for sixty years had ceased to be the residence of the Popes, had been revolutionized by Rienzi just eight years before the Ottoman crossed the Hellespont. To crown all, the terrible pestilence, known as the Black Death, had broken out in 1350, and in the course of twenty years it reduced the population of Western Christendom by nearly one-half. In all the history of Europe there was scarcely a more troubled time than that in which the Turk established himself on its soil.

The Eastern Christian States were also divided among themselves. Russia had been conquered by the Mongols a century before, and its princes were vassals of the Khans of the Golden Horde. Hungary and Poland, the two most powerful nations of Eastern Europe, had both been ravaged by the same foes. The Balkan Peninsula, once united under the Emperors of Constantinople, was divided into numerous Slavonian principalities and kingdoms. Bosnia, Bulgaria, Albania, Wallachia and Servia were all independent kingdoms, often engaged in wars between themselves. Greece, Macedonia and Roumelia were all that remained of territory to the successor of the Cæsars at Constantinople in the middle of the fourteenth century. In culture and wealth the imperial capital was still the foremost city of the world, but as a

power in war her Government was weaker than the least of her neighbors.

The schism raised by the Patriarch Cellularius in the eleventh century, and continued by the statecraft of the Emperors, had raised a wall of separation between the East and West of Christian Europe. The smaller Slavonian States and Russia, which had originally received the Faith from Greek missionaries before the schism, followed the example of the capital and recognized the spiritual authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople while rejecting the rule of its Emperor. There does not, in truth, appear to have been much hostility to the Roman Church in those lands; but at Constantinople the hatred of the Latin Christians was intense, and the Western nations naturally felt but little sympathy with a hostile population, even though Christian. It was into a Europe so divided that the Turkish armies advanced to conquer.

Amurath found other objects than Constantinople for his attack when he established himself in Europe. The Greek Emperor was obsequious to the barbarian invaders, and by the payment of a large tribute he escaped for a time. The Catholic King of Hungary was of a different mold, and he gathered an army to expel the Mahometan invaders from European soil. The Pope, Urban V., did not allow his Christian sympathies to be suppressed by the schismatic hostility of the Greeks, and he proclaimed a crusade for the expulsion of the Turks. The Emperor of Constantinople timidly kept aloof and aided the Turkish invaders from his treasury, but Servia, Bosnia and Wallachia joined forces with the Hungarians against Amurath. An army of twenty thousand men marched on Adrianople under the King of Hungary in 1363, but it was surprised and routed on the banks of the Marizza. Amurath followed up his victory by a series of campaigns against the smaller Balkan States. In 1376 he captured Nissa, and forced the King of Servia to become tributary. The Bulgarian King, Sisvan, followed the example of Servia.

A crowd of Turkish settlers now poured into Roumelia to share the lands of the conquered Christians. The Greek Emperor Palæologus at length realized the danger, and applied for help to the Sovereign Pontiff whose authority his people had so long despised. The Emperor went himself to Rome and was well received there, but the great schism of the West which divided the Church for forty years had begun a few years before, and the powers of the Sovereign Pontiffs were almost paralyzed. Palæologus, on his return to Constantinople, was threatened fiercely by Amurath for his negotiations with Rome. It is noteworthy how the Turkish Moslems, from their first appearance in Europe, have supported the Eastern schism against Catholic unity. The expediency of such

a course for the barbarian infidels is evident, but it is hard to see how the Christians who were falling under their iron rule should have lent themselves to the designs of the common foe. The Greek Emperor sent his son to serve in the Turkish army as a pledge of his friendship, and Amurath was appeased; but it became all but impossible for Catholic Europe to save a Christian nation which was ready to join hands with its Mahometan assailants a few months after appealing for Christian aid.

The Slavonian States of the Balkan were braver than the degenerate Greeks, and in 1388 a league was formed between Servia, Bosnia and Bulgaria for the expulsion of the Asiatic invaders. Servia, now so small a State, had been the dominant power in the Balkan Peninsula a couple of generations earlier, and its king now assumed the headship of the Slavonic league. The countries which formed it mostly belonged to the Greek schism, but they were aided by numerous Catholic volunteers from Hungary, Poland and Albania. The struggle was decided in 1389 on the Field of Kossova, in Servia, and resulted in the utter defeat of the Christians and the capture of their king, who was butchered on the field by order of the bloodthirsty Amurath. The latter had received a mortal wound in the action, and only lived a few moments after the execution of the Christian monarch. Bajazet, the son and successor of Amurath, gave a still more revolting example of Turkish ways. As soon as his father breathed his last he ordered the murder of his own brother, Yacoub, who had commanded the left wing of the Turks in the battle. Such were the ways of the men whose rule the Greeks preferred to union with the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Western Christian world.

Bajazet followed up the victory of Kossova with barbarous energy. He made Bulgaria a province of his empire, and made Servia, Bosnia and Wallachia beyond the Danube recognize him as their Lord Paramount and pay yearly tribute. The power of the schismatic Christian nations was utterly broken by the battle of Kossova, and the successor and son of the murdered King of Servia became the obedient vassal of Bajazet, and for over twelve years led his Christian warriors to war for the extension of Turkish dominion. Henceforth the Catholic nations were the only foe of the Turk worth notice, and the resources of the Eastern Christians were at the command of the Moslem.

Bajazet, after his victory, passed into Asia and reduced all the hitherto independent Turkish princes of Asia Minor under the Ottoman rule. The title of Sultan was first assumed by him, as the former Ottoman rulers had contented themselves with the title of Emir, or Prince. A further distinction of Bajazet is that he was the first drunkard of the race of Osman; and, indeed, his moral

character was so infamous in other respects that even his own subjects regarded it with horror. The murder of his brother is excused by the Turkish historians on the grounds of expediency, so it may be imagined, rather than described, what the crimes were which merited the reproach of such complaisant moralists. But if a true barbarian in cruelty and lust, the first Ottoman Sultan was also a fearless and skilful warrior, and he went on conquering and ravaging for twelve years after Kossova with scarcely a check. The Christians of the Peninsula had been crushed, but Sigismund of Hungary took up the cause of Christendom, and in 1394 Pope Boniface proclaimed another crusade against the Ottoman invaders. Volunteers from France and Germany to the number of twelve thousand flocked to Hungary in 1396 under the command of the Count de Nevers and the Count of Hohenzollern. Western Europe was now, for the first time, to meet the Ottoman warriors in battle, and Sigismund gathered the whole force of Hungary for the expulsion of the barbarian Turk. Bajazet and the combined Christian forces met at Nicopolis in Bulgaria on the 24th of September, and the result was disastrous to the Christians. The young French knights, though individually brave, had no notion of the need of strict discipline. A battle, in their ideas, was merely an opportunity for each knight to display his personal daring, and when Sigismund drew out his army for battle the French constable and others insisted on charging the Turks with the French cavalry without waiting for the general advance. Their reckless charge broke the Turkish Janissaries and the cavalry which tried to cover their retreat, and victory was within the grasp of the Christians if the Frenchmen had waited for the infantry to overtake them; but in their presumptuous folly the knights disdained to stop, and pushed on until they were surrounded by the whole Turkish force and almost exterminated. Bajazet restored his battle order and moved steadily on the Hungarians, who fought bravely, but were finally broken by a charge of the Servian Christian allies of Bajazet. Ten thousand Christians were made prisoners, who were massacred by the Sultan's order on the field. The French commander was spared for ransom, and was allowed to select twenty-four of his companions for quarter. Knights and soldiers alike, the other prisoners were butchered without mercy.

The victory of Nicopolis raised the pride of Bajazet beyond all bounds. He announced his purpose of conquering Italy and feeding his horse on the high altar of St. Peter's. In the meantime he marched southwards, and conquered the whole of Greece almost without a blow. Submission did not save the unfortunate Greeks from Bajazet's savagery. Thirty thousand of them were carried off into Asia, and Turcoman shepherds were brought to

take their place in the old classic land. Athens had been for a century independent under a French dynasty, and it fell before the Turks in 1397. The Sultan next ordered the Greek Emperor to surrender his remaining dominions, or else to expect the extermination of his people and himself. With one of the few flashes of spirit which light up the last days of the Byzantine State, the emperor refused. "We know our weakness," he added, "but we trust in the God of Justice, who protects the lowly and puts down the high." These words soon received a striking illustration in the hitherto victorious Sultan.

Another and a mightier barbarian than Bajazet had come from the Tartary steppes. This was the terrible Timour, better known to Europeans as Tamerlane, a Mongol, and not a Turk, though a fanatic Mahometan. Bajazet, after Nicopolis, had pushed his Asiatic dominions to the frontiers of Armenia, and there he came in contact with the Mongol hordes. The two Mahometan conquerors clashed, and in 1402 Timour led half a million of warriors into Asia Minor. Bajazet met him near the city of Angora, and his army was utterly destroyed. The Sultan himself and one of his sons became prisoners, and within eight months his haughty spirit broke, and he died a captive. Timour only survived him two years, and they were marked by the destruction of Smyrna, where the conquerors built up a pyramid with the skulls of its slaughtered Christian population.

The Ottoman power survived the fall of Bajazet. After ten years of civil wars, Mahomet I., the last surviving son of the captured Sultan, reunited his father's dominions. He did not war on the Christian nations around him, and Constantinople had a brief respite. With the accession of his son, Amurath II., in 1421, this came to an end, and the young Sultan (he was only eighteen when he took his father's place) laid siege to Constantinople with a formidable army. The Sultan promised his soldiers all the wealth of the richest capital then existing as their reward, and one body of dervishes, led by a fanatic named Seid Bokhari, stipulated for all the nuns within the devoted city as their own special prize. The city was assaulted on the 25th of August, but the Greeks fought with desperation and repulsed the foe. Amurath finally accepted an annual tribute as the price of peace, and Constantinople was spared yet awhile.

War was the natural occupation of a Turkish Sultan, and, after his treaty with the Greek Emperor, Amurath turned his armies against Hungary. He found harder work in this direction. He was driven from Belgrade, and the famed John Hunyades appeared as leader of the Christian forces in 1442. His first exploit was the destruction of a Turkish army which was besieging Herman-

stadt. His next, the defeat of eighty thousand Moslems at Vasag with much smaller forces. The next year the Hungarian leader invaded the Sultan's own dominions with an army swelled by numerous volunteers from other Christian lands. His campaign was brilliantly successful. He routed the Turkish main army on the Morava, in Servia, then took Sophia, in Bulgaria, and forced the passage of the Balkan Mountains in the depth of winter. On the south of that range the Turks again attacked him, and again their forces were scattered. But instead of pushing on to Adrianople, and so ending the war, the Hungarian army returned to its own country after these exploits. Valor and right might be with the Christians, but in the statesmanship which knows how to use victories superiority was with the Osmanli Sultans.

The campaign, however, resulted in a treaty of peace by which the Sultan gave up his claims to Wallachia and acknowledged the independence of Servia. The Greek Emperor and the Papal Legate in Hungary, Cardinal Julian, protested against the folly of leaving the Turkish barbarians in possession of European soil, and King Lladislas renewed hostilities in 1444. With a small army he laid siege to Varna, in Bulgaria, and under its walls he was attacked by Amurath with a far superior force. The battle was fierce, and Amurath at one time was flying from the field; but the death of the Hungarian King, who fought with the chivalry of a knight but not the prudence of a general, and was cut down in the front of battle, changed the fortunes of the day. The Hungarian army was utterly defeated, and all the fruits of Hunyades's former campaigns lost. The Turks reconquered Servia and Bosnia, and in the latter country many of the nobles did not scruple to declare themselves Mahometans for the security of their lands and power. The remaining six years of Amurath's life were employed in thoroughly establishing Turkish rule in the newly conquered lands, and in fruitless invasions of Albania, where Castnot, with a handful of men, successfully defied his power. He died in 1451, leaving the Ottoman Empire restored to even more than its extent and power before the field of Angora.

Amurath and his father, though Turks, had been of milder and more generous character than others of the race of Osman. Mahomet II., who now succeeded to supreme power at the age of twenty, was a brutal savage, but, like his great-grandfather, Bajazet, he united the skill of a general and the craft of a consummate politician to brutal passions. His first act as Sultan was to cause his sole brother, an infant at the breast, to be drowned at the very moment when his mother was offering himself her congratulations on his accession. Almost his last instructions were these: "The majority of my jurists have pronounced that it is

right for such of my descendants as ascend the throne to slay their brothers, lest the world be disturbed. It will be their duty so to act." Throughout his life the Sultan showed himself alike cruel and faithless. When the Venetian garrison of Eubœa surrendered under a pledge of safety, he had them all tortured to death in the fashion of an Indian savage. After the conquest of Constantinople he had his table decorated with the still-bleeding heads of a family of Greek nobles. Such was the man who was to establish Turkish rule in the capital of Eastern Christendom, and whose descendants reign there still.

The first year of Mahomet's reign was devoted to preparations for the siege of Constantinople. He specially applied himself to providing new and formidable artillery, for which end he used the skill of a renegade Christian. Within the devoted city the Emperor Constantine Palælogus left nothing undone for the safety of his people, but his efforts were baffled by the schismatic bigotry of the majority of his subjects. A few years before, at the Council of Florence, in 1440, the representatives of the Greek Church had formally returned to catholic union; but even in the deadly peril now approaching, the largest part of the population and clergy of Constantinople rejected the measure. Constantine was denounced as a heretic when he called the people to arms, and only six thousand Greek soldiers could be raised in the great city in its critical hour. The Grand Duke Notaras, the commander of this force, did not hesitate to declare he would rather see the Sultan's turban than the Pope's tiara in his native city. Some Spanish and Italian volunteers, and a small detachment of veterans sent by the Sovereign Pontiff, were the chief force to dispute with the Turk the fate of Constantinople.

The siege was begun in April by an army reckoned at from seventy to two hundred thousand Turks. The Christian forces were only nine thousand, but they did their duty like men, drove back one general assault, and kept the Sultan at bay for nearly two months. On the 24th of May Mahomet sent a final summons to surrender, and Constantine replied that he would die before he yielded his native city. A final assault was made five days later. The Grand Duke, even then, refused to supply artillery to the Genoese auxiliaries, and the brunt of the defence was borne by the Latin soldiers. After a heroic struggle, force prevailed. The Emperor was cut down in the breach and the barbarian hordes poured into the city. A general massacre followed, until the greed of the Turkish warriors began to prevail over their cruelty, and the Greek population was gathered for slavery or ransom. Mahomet rode in after a few hours' carnage and entered the Cathedral of Saint Sophia, where he mounted the high altar and

ordered a muezzin to call the Moslems to the noon prayer from the top of Saint Sophia. The Cathedral of Justinian, the first church of the Christians of the East, was handed over to Mahometan worship. The Sultan ordered his soldiers to be recalled to their ranks. Constantinople was now his own, and he did not wish its wealth to fall to other robbers. He spoke words of protection towards the conquered, and he showed their meaning by acts. Notaras, the highest in rank of the Grecian nobles and the commander of the city troops, had not fallen like the Emperor and the Latin soldiers. He had retired to his house, and he was now to learn what his choice of the Mahometan turban rather than the Papal tiara meant. The Sultan sent for him, and after some words of encouragement and fair promises asked the names of the leading Grecian nobles. The Grand Duke gave them, and with a savage laugh the Sultan repeated them to his soldiery, with the announcement that he would pay a thousand sequins for each of their heads. Notaras was dismissed for the time, and Mahomet entered the deserted palace of the Cæsars, where he gave himself up to brutal orgy. At night, when drunk with wine, he ordered the child of the Grand Duke to be brought in as an object for his brutal lust. Notaras at last recovered some sense of duty and boldly refused to obey. He and his family were immediately beheaded, and the gory heads set on the Sultan's table as a fitting ornament of victory and Moslem clemency. The Turk was lord in Constantinople.

Bryan J. Clinch.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND MODERN SCIENCE.

IT has been the lot of Divine Truth, ever since it came into the world, to find itself in opposition, at one time or another, with all the world's greatest forces—political power, public opinion, human passion in all its forms; knowledge, finally, human knowledge, the most formidable power of all.

It is with this last that Religion has had mainly to contend during the present century, and under peculiarly unfavorable conditions; for while, on the one hand, the great Christian schools of the Old World were broken up by a series of political revolutions, secular science developed with amazing rapidity, adding year after year to its conquests, and winning to itself the admiration and trust of the whole civilized world. As a consequence, the supreme and universal homage which former ages were wont to pay to Religion has been succeeded in our time by a divided allegiance. Many, indeed, are as true to the faith now as at any other period. But many more are shaken in their loyalty; not a few have completely renounced it and turned to Science as to a new revelation that has opened to man unknown worlds, extended his empire in almost every direction, and added indefinitely to the comforts and enjoyments of his daily life. Truly, Science is the idol of the day. Its name is the greatest of all to conjure with. What Science smiles on obtains a ready acceptance; what she ignores can with difficulty get a hearing; what she decidedly objects to cannot, humanly speaking, expect to prevail. Hence the eagerness with which the defenders of Religion strive to win her sympathies, or at the least to remove all appearance of antagonism, while the chief concern of her adversaries is to prove that between Science and Faith no genuine agreement is possible.

Of course all Christians know that between true science and religion, properly understood, there can be no real conflict. Both proceed from God; both are the expression of His mind, and His words can never be in opposition with His works. But between *what is taught* in the name of Science and *what is held* in the name of Religion, the conflict is not only possible but real and frequent. Nor are the responsibilities all on one side, for the feeling of distrust is mutual, theologians often watching too suspiciously the efforts of scientific investigation, while many scientists are much too ready to disregard all religious teaching and resent any questioning of their conclusions on religious grounds.

It is among the latter that are found the most dangerous assail-

ants of religion in our day. Some combat it only when it crosses their path and interferes with the special courses of thought which they pursue. In others we find a deep and general antipathy which leads them to take up whatever line of argument is most likely to prove effective and to fling at religion anything that can hurt. Such was Voltaire in the last century; such is Ingersoll in ours. Such Dr. Draper, of New York, who, more than twenty years ago, forsook the natural sciences, in which he had acquired a name, to write a so-called "History of the Conflict between Religion and Science" for which he was neither prepared nor fitted. Violent and vulgar in tone, incorrect in language, transparently ignorant in many of the questions he undertakes to deal with, he offers a striking contrast with another opponent, Huxley, whose brilliant qualities of thought and style, coupled with the keenest wit, have made one of the most dangerous contemporary adversaries of all kinds of religion. The Christian apologist can well afford to neglect Dr. Draper; he cannot overlook Huxley. But if he wishes to find, summed up in an ingenious and striking shape, the objections that have been urged with most success against supernatural belief during the present century, he need go no farther than the work of Dr. Andrew D. White, late President of Cornell University, entitled "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom."

I.

Though quite recently published (1896), Dr. White's book can scarcely be called new. The chapters of which it is composed have steadily succeeded each other for several years in the pages of the *Popular Science Monthly*, and in the present work they are simply put together with a short introduction and some slight additions and alterations.

As a picture of the progress of the human mind in many directions, the book is full of interest. Nothing is more curious than to observe the workings of men's thoughts in presence of the problems of Nature with which they were confronted from the beginning. The principle of causality, once awakened, extends gradually to everything that shows a beginning or a change. The mind of the race, especially in its early stages, is, like the mind of a child, full of questionings, but easy to satisfy. It is with a continual smile that one reads at the present day of the notions that prevailed for long ages regarding the structure of the earth, the nature of the heavenly bodies, and of the manner in which the more striking phenomena of the visible world were accounted for. Theories, speculations, guesses, often of the crudest kind, empty formulas supplied the place of modern observation and induction;

and minds, sagacious and powerful in other spheres, acquiesced in them in the most childlike fashion. They were satisfied, for instance, to be told that if we see the flash of lightning before we hear the accompanying roll of thunder, it is because the sense of sight is nobler than that of hearing. Bede's conception of the Universe, representing the firmament as spherical in form and of a subtle and fiery nature, the upper heavens, where the angels reside, being tempered with ice, lest they should inflame the lower elements, while lower down a supply of water, referred to in Genesis i. 7, serves to allay the fire of the stars,—this conception, with its innumerable developments and complications borrowed from the ancients, satisfied men's minds for hundreds of years.

Dr. White's book abounds in particulars of this kind drawn from the most varied sources and spreading over the whole field of human knowledge—geology, astronomy, medicine, geography, philology, social science, etc. Taken as a whole, it forms a striking picture of the weakness of man's first attempts to solve the enigmas of nature, and shows how hard it has been for the most enlightened and gifted to pierce the crust of prejudice under which their contemporaries continued to entertain the most arbitrary and often the silliest notions. In this light the work might well be called "A History of Human Obtuseness and Credulity." But it was not as a psychological study nor as a description of human discovery, like Whewell's "History of the Inductive Sciences," that the book was meant by its author. Under a historical form it is avowedly a polemical work, having for its purpose to show how much Science has had to suffer, not from human ignorance or human folly, but from Religion and its representatives; and at the same time, how badly both have fared for having attempted to impede her irresistible progress. This is the conclusion to which each chapter leads in succession, and hence the title of the book: "Warfare of Science with Theology," than which none could be more appropriate, unless it had been "The Total Discomfiture and Defeat of Religion by Modern Science." To such a title Dr. White would, of course, object. He claims, in fact, to write in the interest of religion no less than of science, and no doubt a book very interesting and equally welcome to both sides could be written on the same general lines—but not by Dr. White. He is a believer in science, and in little more. He tells us, indeed, in his preface that he was bred a churchman, that many of his friends, as well as his dearest relatives, were deeply religious, and that he himself is a great lover of the externals of religion—ecclesiastical architecture, church music, and the like. But he claims no more, and no more can be expected in one who dismisses as legendary some of the most important facts of the Old and New Testament,

and who takes no pains to conceal his decided dislike for all the supernatural aspects of religion.

That a book written in so hostile a spirit, by so able (?) a man, and on a variety of delicate subjects of which few are able to judge for themselves, should be a serious danger to the faith of ordinary readers is something so self-evident that it need not be dwelt upon. The truth is, one can scarcely conceive how any intelligent person, not specially prepared for such a test, could, short of a special grace from God, withstand the accumulated pressure of so many insidious difficulties and lay down the book unshaken in the faith. To many priests, even, it would be far from harmless. Yet it may be a part of their professional duty to become acquainted with it. The "Warfare" has had a wide circulation and many readers in its earlier and in its latest form, and there is every likelihood of its remaining for years as an arsenal from which freethinkers will continue to draw forth some of their most dangerous weapons. To resist them effectively each chapter would require a separate and some an elaborate treatment; but this being out of the question here, we may be permitted at least to point out briefly the equivocal methods of the writer and the fallacies that underlie his principal arguments.

II.

First of all, we miss in Dr. White that judicial fairness which wins the trust of the thoughtful reader. Indeed, he hardly leaves room for expecting it, his work being professedly written to carry the fight into the very lines of those who, in the name of religion, had opposed the establishment of a university (Cornell) dissevered from all positive beliefs. He holds, and his whole work meant to prove, that such separation is a necessity, because religion, exeept of the vaguest kind, interferes and has always interfered with the growth of human knowledge. His sympathies instinctively go forth towards unbelievers, even to the half-crazed and wholly disreputable Giordano Bruno. In his zeal to find believers in the wrong he goes the length of putting a literal construction on the metaphors of the early Fathers and on the allegorical devices of mediæval artists. He steadily keeps out of sight the grave motives which inspired the action of those he condemns. Indeed, he seems incapable of realizing the fact that their religious beliefs were to them the dearest of treasures, and that what seemed to endanger them they were bound to resist with all their might.

Dr. White undertakes to show Science in constant opposition with what he calls Theology, but he succeeds only by giving the word theology a breadth of meaning never before heard of. He actually comprises under it every variety of religious opinion,

every individual fancy, every superstition born of ignorance, even the silliest, every notion, in a word, connected by anybody with God or the unseen world! Thus the attempts of early ecclesiastical writers to interpret the work of creation as described in Genesis; the conception of Nature, its phenomena and its laws handed down from classical antiquity and held during the Middle Ages, often mingling, as was natural, with the religious ideas of the period; the views commonly held about the more striking cosmic phenomena, such as thunder, lightning, earthquakes, storms, etc.; or, again, as to the nature, the causes and the remedies of certain forms of disease; all this, and much more of a similar kind, Dr. White sets down to the account of Theology! With such a store to draw from, it is no difficult matter for him to win victories for Science all along the line. But we know, and Dr. White should know, that Theology is in no degree responsible for the views and speculations of individual theologians, still less for the numberless vagaries of weak or disordered minds, or for the superstitious beliefs and practices current in periods of general ignorance, and which Theology as much as Science has helped to dispel.

By a similar abuse of terms Dr. White raises a prejudice in the minds of his readers against what is most dear to all believers: *dogmatic truth* and *orthodoxy*. "Dogma" means fixed doctrine; "orthodoxy" means faithfulness to it. There is nothing dogmatic in personal views or free opinions on any religious subject; so long as they are free they cannot be unorthodox, neither may they be called orthodox except in a negative sense, that is, as sinning against no canon of belief. Yet if Dr. White happens to meet an opinion proven false, which at any time was connected in men's minds with religion, he at once entitles it the "dogmatic view," the "orthodox doctrine." It is in this way that he writes at considerable length about the belief in former ages that Hebrew was the language taught by God himself to our first parents, an opinion to which nobody felt bound, as soon as reasons were seen for doubting it.

That some of these opinions have been warmly defended as belonging to the faith, and have even received in some measure the sanction of authority, cannot be denied. But to argue therefrom, as Dr. White constantly does, against the infallibility claimed by the Catholic Church, is a position into which a man of his enlightenment should not have so persistenly committed himself.

III.

To make this fully intelligible to our lay readers, let it suffice to observe that the Church has never assumed, nor has she ever

been looked upon by enlightened Catholics as possessing, the privilege of infallibility on any subject beyond the principles of religion and duty. Outside these, and what is necessarily involved in the function of guarding and teaching them, mistakes, though unlikely, remain possible. Furthermore, even within the very limited sphere of infallibility thus claimed, comparatively few of the Church's acts or statements bear the seal of inerrancy. This supreme sanction is set only upon what popes, or councils, or the collective voice of pastors and faithful solemnly proclaim as belonging to revealed truth.

Beyond these narrow limits guaranteed by the divine promises the Catholic has to be satisfied with a lower degree of certitude, such as is supplied to him by the natural sources of knowledge. In his religious beliefs all is worthy of respect, but all is not equally certain. Theology, which is only religion thrown into scientific shape, besides defined dogmas, comprises an incomparably larger number of commonly accepted doctrines from which a Catholic rarely feels at liberty to depart, and, on a lower plane, a still richer harvest of deductions, opinions, speculations, conjectures, which come and go freely, and are taken up or dropped by schools or by individuals according to their personal judgment or the prevailing influences of the hour. These distinctions, familiar to theologians, are unknown, it is true, to the great majority of the faithful. The same as children, they look upon all that has been told them in their religious instruction as part of the Christian Doctrine. They grow up in that belief, and thousands live and die holding on to religious notions which rest on the slenderest foundations, simply because these notions have originally come to them with the rest, and were delivered to them as an explanation or as a development of essential doctrines.

Such then is Theology; at the centre a solid nucleus of divine truth, next, a stratum of doctrines clinging so closely as to seem part of the original formation; finally, a vast aggregate of elements floating more or less freely around the centre, and subject to all manner of changes. These distinctions all theologians admit, though they may, and often do, disagree, when it is a question of determining to which sphere such or such elements belong. Dr. White can hardly be ignorant of them. But if so, what value can he attach himself to most of his arguments against Catholic theology, Church authority and papal infallibility? What if, in ages of ignorance, people connected superstitious notions with the facts of Nature? What if individual theologians shared their error? That may have been their fault, or the fault of the age, but surely not the fault of the Church or of Theology. What if Bede and the Fathers spoke of the work of creation as they saw

it, and interpreted the Bible narratives according to the notions of their time? They claimed no special authority for their interpretations, and if later ages surrounded their views with especial reverence, it was only until other views more accurate should have established their right to supersede them. Theologians may have clung with unnecessary tenacity to the literal sense of Scripture and exhibited undue warmth in defending it; but, once more, nobody ever believed them to be infallible. Even if we admit, in the words of Dr. White, that "Conceptions held in the Church during many centuries, 'always, everywhere, and by all' (the celebrated criterion of Vincent of Lerins) were, on the whole, steadily hostile to truth," our belief in the Church's infallibility shall be in nowise lessened, so long as these conceptions were held as mere human interpretations of the divine word, not as articles of faith.

Such interpretations, it is true, have been occasionally endorsed and enforced by the Church, as in the celebrated case of Galileo. Here, according to Dr. White, the doctrine of infallibility completely breaks down. But the merest tyro of Catholic theology could have told him that the infallibility of the Church or of the Pope was not engaged in the question at any time. The case was in the hands of theologians, of cardinals, of congregations, all liable to be mistaken. The Pope, indeed, favored and sanctioned their action; but a solemn decree *ex cathedra*, in which alone a Pope is infallible, was never thought of in connection with Galileo.

The same remarks apply to the question of lucrative money-lending, on which Dr. White descants at length. Even if we admit that the aim of the Church right through the Middle Ages was to prevent making money on loans, and that Popes and theologians shared the notion of Aristotle that money, being "barren of its nature," could not lawfully be made productive, yet amid all that was held and taught on the subject, no solemn, final definition can be brought forward. In this, as in some other instances, Dr. White may point to the exercise of a certain disciplinary power, or even to minor acts of doctrinal authority, the wisdom of which may be justly questioned; but such cases, so long as they remain outside the sphere of action for which inerrancy is claimed, prove nothing, and are only so many instances of the sophism which logicians call *ignorantia elenchi*, that is, proving something different from what has to be proved.

IV.

Another sophism which pervades the whole course of Dr. White's argument is based on the ambiguous meaning of his second term, Science.

The word Science had been long employed and understood va-

riously as signifying knowledge in general, or knowledge fully ascertained, or knowledge systematized. But for some time the representatives of the natural sciences have appropriated the term to themselves and to their special department, as if it could be claimed by no other, besides implying that whatever is scientific is certain and cannot be questioned. But it takes only a little attention to see how much there is in all this of gratuitous assumption. Everybody knows that there are social, moral and metaphysical, as well as physical sciences, and that, in the latter as well as in the former there are elements of very unequal value. In the realm of Nature, endless observations and experiments have given, it is true, to a vast number of facts and laws an authority never again to be questioned; but how many others still await a more thorough verification, while, high above them all, the general theories which so powerfully captivate the popular mind are only plausible guesses? Men talk fluently of ether, electricity, chemical attraction, gravitation, molecules, and atoms, as if they could spread them all out before our eyes; yet what are they all but hypotheses, guesses—likely enough so long as they account for the facts, but liable to disappear any day in presence of some broader synthesis, or simpler explanation, or of new facts they are insufficient to account for.

All this Dr. White contrives to forget. Everything connected with scientific observation he lays down as unquestionable, and his preferences almost invariably turn to what is remotest from the lines followed by Christian writers.

Thus, for example, the question of the antiquity and early history of the human race, considered in the light of modern discovery, is assuredly much more difficult to handle to-day than a hundred years ago; but that is no reason to take for granted, as Dr. White does, the countless ages assigned to man by certain scientists, or his universal evolution from a condition much nearer that of a brute than of a rational being. Both are strongly contested by no less distinguished scientists of another school.

"Theology" and "Science" are not the only terms which need distinction and elucidation. "Evolution" is another, having many meanings, which Dr. White is never concerned to keep asunder, being always ready to endorse whatever bears the magic name. As a theory, evolution admits of all manner of forms, degrees and spheres of action. It may be confined to inanimate nature and account for the facts of astronomy and geology, without being extended any farther. Or it may be carried into the kingdom of plants and animals, and stop short at man. Or it may, in its course, be made to include man himself. There is a theistic theory of evolution which claims only to show on what lines the work

of creation was carried out by its divine Author, and there is an atheistic evolution which sets aside the notion of God altogether. There is a limited conception of evolution, with breaks which imply the introduction, from time to time, of a new form of action, as in the passsge from inorganic to organized beings; from plant to animal life; from the instincts of the animal to the mind and conscience of man; and there is a radical conception of the theory which assigns to the same blind forces the formation of everything, from the primary elements of matter to the human being in his highest development. In some of its forms the theory can scarcely be questioned; in others it is utterly inadmissible; in its intermediate stages it may be a legitimate subject of controversy among scientists or among believers. But with Dr. White such distinctions do not exist. For him evolution, in all its Darwinian fulness, is a demonstrated truth by which all else is to be judged.

These are some of the methods by which Dr. White pursues his "warfare" and tries to raise a prejudice against religion as being at all times the great obstacle to the onward march of Science. It is this position that we have now to consider in itself.

V.

That mistaken religious views held by Catholics or by Protestants may have occasionally, in the course of ages, interfered—unnecessarily and unduly interfered—with scientific development, we have no reason to question on abstract grounds, no wish to deny as a fact; but that there is anything in that fact, reduced to its true proportions, to justify the animosity of Dr. White and others against Religion we utterly fail to perceive. In fact, we hold that the opposition so bitterly complained of was most natural in the circumstances; that it was even serviceable; that it was far from being the only or the principal obstacle science had to contend with; finally that, of the numerous instances of religious opposition to science brought forward by Dr. White, there are extremely few in which any appreciable delay was caused, as a fact, in the onward course of Science itself.

We say, first of all, that it was most natural that when modern science dawned on the world men should be found holding, side by side with the true faith, many mistaken notions about Nature which had become part of their religious beliefs. As we have already remarked, one of the primary exigencies of the human mind is to seek a cause for whatever is seen to begin or to change. Long after the earlier stages of man's development he remained still in primitive ignorance of the true forces of Nature; but at the same time he had an intense belief in the powers of the invisible world, and to them he naturally attributed the facts of the visible

world, especially the exceptional, striking facts he could not otherwise account for. Thus earthquakes were looked upon as special marks of God's wrath; comets were believed to be missiles hurled at a wicked world, or, at the least, signs foreboding some great calamity. Storms and lightning came from the heavens and were visibly the work of the Creator or of "the powers of the air." The strange features of nervous diseases caused them to be referred by pagans and Christians alike to similar agencies. In a word, everything unusual and striking in Nature impressed men with a mysterious dread, as the work of supernatural beings.

This religious philosophy of the visible word was very attractive. It sated that craving for the marvellous which is natural to man; it gave scope to his imagination; it fostered the religious spirit, making daily life full of heavenly signs and special providences, turning men's thought to God, and steeping their whole existence in an atmosphere of faith. Can we wonder if they eagerly clung to it and turned a deaf ear to Science so long as she could speak, as was always the case in the beginning, only with hesitating manner and uncertain voice? The older conceptions had so become a part of their mental structure, they were so wedded to their holiest impressions and dearest memories, that to exchange them for others seemed like parting with their faith and piety, or, to say the least, with what had helped to sustain one and the other. Natural explanations of what had been so long considered a direct action of God were looked upon as irreligious. As early as the fourth century we find Cæsarius, brother of St. Basil, declaring impious the opinion of those who in earthquakes saw nothing but natural phenomena, and as late as the beginning of the last century we find Newton's theory combated by the consideration that by it "he took from God that direct action on His works so constantly ascribed to Him in Scripture, and transferred it to mechanical laws," and that "he substituted gravitation for Providence." But such resistance was not generally of long duration. It had to yield to the evidence of facts or to a series of irresistible inductions, and gradually men's beliefs and devotions came to be built on different lines.

The same observations apply to the numerous mistaken notions which had been gathered from too literal an interpretation of Scripture. Our ideas of the natural world are so exclusively derived in this age from direct observation that we can scarcely conceive of their being sought for elsewhere. But in past times it was just the opposite. In their inability to sound the mysteries by which they were surrounded, men instinctively turned for information to a higher source, and they seemed to have found it in the Bible. Here was a book coming from God himself and touch-

ing on all manner of subjects, describing in particular the formation of the heavens and the earth, containing the early history of mankind, and accounting for many things, besides, of which no other explanation could be had. What more natural than to accept all this as it stood? Of course it was seen plainly enough that some things were spoken of in Scripture not as they are but as they strike the senses and affect the imagination; but partly through ignorance, partly through a mistaken reverence, much was taken literally which in the mind of the sacred writer was only metaphorical or poetic, and the rule obtained that the literal sense was to prevail when no sufficient reason appeared to depart from it. Now, during the lengthened period to which we refer, most of the reasons subsequently discovered were unknown. Thus nobody, for example, saw any reason why the visible Universe should not have begun to exist only six thousand years ago; why the earth should not have been made just as it is in six ordinary days; why the deluge should not have covered the whole surface of the earth, or why Noah might not have accommodated in the ark couples of all the animals which the flood would have destroyed. Nobody saw any special difficulty in the earth being immovably fixed on its foundations, with the sun, moon and stars revolving around it. As a consequence, the passages of the Bible bearing on these and scores of similar facts were understood literally by all, and the information which they seemed to convey was welcomed by all as introducing to a region of knowledge inaccessible at the time to any other mode of investigation, besides giving an assurance which God's word could alone impart, according to the saying of St. Augustine in this same connection: *Major est Scripturæ auctoritas quam omnis humani ingenii capacitas.*

Above all, the divine source from which this knowledge was supposed to flow gave it a special sacredness in the eyes of all true believers. They lovingly and reverently dwelt upon it; they made it a basis of speculation, and built upon it by the deductive methods of the times. It became truly a part of their philosophy and of their religion. What, then, could be expected, when all these notions came to be assailed in the name of new theories and discoveries, but a hearty denunciation of the latter "as false in philosophy (the terms employed in the case of Galileo) and heretical in religion"?

Not being himself a believer, Dr. White cannot, perhaps, understand the extreme importance which doctrines have for those who look upon them as coming from God. Yet, that belief once admitted, what more natural than the anxious solicitude with which believers watch over every particle of what, rightly or wrongly, they consider part of the sacred treasure, and the energy

with which, when it is assailed, they defend it. Far from begetting in the scientist a feeling of irritation, as is too often the case, it should rather awaken his sympathy and lead him to touch with a gentle hand what he must recognize as some of the worthiest as well as the deepest and tenderest feelings of the human heart.

And as regards himself, he, too, should remember that he is not infallible; that his great victories have been won at the cost of numberless defeats, and that the imperishable monuments which he has ultimately succeeded in erecting are built on the ruins of long-forgotten speculations, repudiated theories and spurious facts. All the sciences began humbly. For many centuries Astronomy was immersed in astrology, Chemistry in alchemy, Physics in metaphysics, History in fable. What was wanting in knowledge was supplied by the fancy—imaginary continents and seas, imaginary animals of the dry land and of the deep. Our theologians believed in them, like everybody else, and occasionally employed them as illustrations and arguments after the fashion of the day. Our commentators embodied them in their interpretations of the Bible, from which it was not easy to disentangle them when it had to be done later on. What is all this but knowledge in its infancy, of which believers have no more reason to be ashamed than scientists, nor one and the other any more than the individual man in his maturity feels embarrassed at the recollection of the childish impressions of his early conscious life.

It is, then, through all these preconceived, mistaken notions that Science had to fight its way. They were not the outcome of religion alone, but of general habit, prejudice and excessive conservatism. Even to-day among the representatives of every science there is a conservative as well as a progressive section. Inventors, discoverers, thinkers have always had to contend with them; and one of their sorest trials has been to find among their opponents the very men who should have been the first to welcome and to help them. The facts of animal magnetism, or hypnotism, as it is now called, were, up to a recent date, steadily denied or contemptously ignored by the leading representatives of science. The possibilities of steam as a motor power, the most important appliances of electricity, were questioned even by specialists until repeated experiments had demonstrated them. Many lives have been lost by the slowness of medical men to adopt new methods of treatment.

Scientists may have to suffer from opposition of this and similar kinds, but Science fares none the worse for it. The more impetuous its rush forward, the more it needs to be kept within proper bounds, and this is the natural function of the other

forms of human knowledge. Scientists unchecked easily wander into speculations of all kinds, philosophical, historical, religious, where they are much exposed to lose themselves. It is the business of the specialists who by right occupy these grounds to awaken them from their dreams and lead them back to their own field of knowledge. This theologians have done successfully again and again, as well as historians, philosophers and their own brother scientists. Where their opposition was mistaken it was seldom effective, and never permanently hurtful to science. While theologians denounced and anathematized, investigators silently pursued their observations and developed their inductions until a full demonstration was reached, and then the battle was won. In a few cases, we are free to confess, the struggle was unnecessarily and unduly lengthened, but that was only the natural outcome of individual obstinacy or deep and widespread prejudice; nor was it by any means confined to Catholics. In fact Dr. White's narrative shows that from the beginning Protestants were generally more extreme and more unyielding than Catholics in their opposition to discoveries which disturbed their old Scriptural notions. Nor must we wonder at this, for whatever touches the Bible threatens them much more than Catholics, whose faith rests not on Scripture but on the living voice of the Church.

VI.

To sum up, Dr. White's history of the relations between Science and Religion is entirely misleading. It is unfriendly and unfair to Religion from beginning to end. This terrible war of which he has undertaken to relate the vicissitudes turns out to be little more than a lively and protracted skirmishing kept up between scientists and theologians of every calibre, and making more noise, as often happens, than doing harm to either side. It is remarkable how seldom the Church interfered, and when she did, how gently, using mostly her disciplinary power only, and never putting forth her full doctrinal authority. And as for waging war on Science, she never as much as thought of it, for Science she recognizes as coming, like herself, from God. True, she has much reason to complain of many scientists, who are constantly going outside their sphere and making unjustifiable inroads into hers. But she says little about it, remembering that among the foremost scientists of the day she reckons some of her most devoted children, and that it would be unfair, anyhow, to make Science responsible for what she neither inspires nor can prevent.

Those who undertake to speak in the name of Science would consult much better for her honor and for their own if they consented to be guided by the same spirit. Religion is not a thing

to be trifled with. Its purposes are too high, its influences too far reaching and too deep, its achievements too great, not to entitle it to respect. And then the world cannot do without it. Not only it fills an abiding need of the soul, and answers questions to which it alone can give a satisfactory reply, but it keeps together the very framework of society. Every experienced and thoughtful man must see that. Dr. White must see it. He does see it, and this is doubtless why he attempts to draw a distinction between Religion and Theology. "Science," he says, "has conquered Dogmatic Theology." (She has done nothing of the kind; just ridded us of mistaken conceptions which had long attached themselves to Theology and unduly assumed its name, that's all.) But he adds, "she (Science) will henceforth go hand in hand with Religion," as if religion without Dogmatic Theology, that is, without a body of doctrines accepted by faith, can be anything but a shadow. This, too, Dr. White's experience of life should have shown him, not perhaps in a few individuals particularly situated and particularly cultivated, but in the bulk of his fellowmen. When they lose their hold on positive belief the rest is sure to follow. In the "Revue des Deux Mondes," the leading European review, its gifted editor, Fr. Brunetière—to-day the honored guest of Johns Hopkins and Harvard—recently published an article which attracted much attention and gave rise to much comment. It was entitled "The Bankruptcy of Science," and its purpose was to show that Science had "failed," not in its proper sphere, not in accomplishing wonderful things, but in fulfilling the promises made, in its name, of sufficing henceforth to give guidance and strength to mankind. The responsive echo which came back to the writer almost from everywhere proved that he had struck the right chord.

If, then, neither Science nor Religion can be dispensed with, if neither can be sacrificed to the other, surely it is not a state of "warfare" that should be proclaimed, but a state of harmony and mutual good-will. This should not be difficult, if we consider how far these two great powers stand apart, or, rather, how distinct they are from each other in their objects and in their methods. "Why," to use the words of Balfour ("Foundations of Belief"), "may we not set up side by side with the creed of natural science another and supplementary set of beliefs which may minister to needs and aspirations which Science cannot meet, and may speak amid silences which Science is powerless to break? The natural world and the spiritual world, the world which is immediately subject to causation and the world which is immediately subject to God, are each of them real, and each of them the objects of real knowledge. But the laws of the natural world

are revealed to us by the discoveries of Science, while the laws of the spiritual world are revealed to us through the authority of spiritual intuitions, inspired witnesses or divinely guided institutions. And the two regions of knowledge lie side by side, contiguous but not connected, like empires of different race and language, without intercourse with each other, except along a disputed and wavering frontier."

Conciliation, therefore, should be the object of all who have at heart the integral satisfaction of man's needs and his full individual and social development. Sixty years ago a man of whom Dr. White speaks in terms of admiration, Cardinal Wiseman, gave the signal of the noble work in his lectures on the "Connection Between Science and Revealed Religion." Would that in this instance admiration had led to imitation!

VII.

Since we venture to admonish others, may we not, at the same time, administer with profit some admonition to ourselves? In all these quarrels are we entirely faultless? If often provoked, have we not been occasionally provoking, clinging tenaciously to antiquated notions which should have long since been given up, or withdrawing from them under a cloud of ambiguous words to hide defeat? We ask scientists to set aside prejudice and give us a fair hearing; are we always ready to listen patiently to them?

It must be confessed that many of the conclusions solidly established by historians, biblical scholars and the like, interfere most unpleasantly with some of our settled notions, and we are sorely tempted to resent the interference. Natural science, too, with its laws and forces, looks sometimes as if its chief purpose were to supersede the divine action and keep God out of sight. Yet it is thus that He would have us henceforth recognize and worship Him. Under the laws of Nature and its active forces He is ever present and ever accessible to those who seek Him. Much depends on the bent of the individual mind. There is the religious mind and there is the secular mind. The religious mind, even in the midst of modern science, still turns instintively to God, and sees created things in their relations with God. The secular mind sees them in themselves and looks no further. The mediæval mind was religious; the modern mind is mainly secular, and it is Science that has made it so. Hence the necessity of reaction, not against Science, but against the evil to which it gives birth.

In nothing are its effects more noticeable than in the relative extension of religious beliefs. In the intellectual conditions of early and mediæval times they grew indefinitely, as we have seen. Sci-

ence has singularly narrowed their sphere. While loyal to the same creed we all believe incomparably fewer things than were believed in former days, and of much that we continue to believe our conceptions are considerably altered. To realize this we have only to take up books written a few hundred years ago, or even fifty years ago. We are, perhaps, none the happier nor the better for the change; but it was inevitable. Nor has it entirely ceased. Slowly but steadily, around the immovable centre of dogma, the religious elements of our minds are disposing themselves differently. Some are clinging more closely, others more loosely, while others still have silently dropped off. This, too, is inevitable. It is, in one shape or another, the law of all intellectual growth, the very law of life. The apologist of the faith has to bear it in mind. In his zeal for the integrity of the sacred treasure he must not add on what, though often connected with, never belonged to it. He must not extend immeasurably his line of defence at the imminent risk of weakening it.

He must not commit himself, still less the Church, to positions which ultimately may have to be abandoned, as happened in the case of Galileo. It is neither dignified nor creditable to be constantly driven back from positions which were held as if they had been vital. On the other hand, he cannot shut himself up in his citadel and fight only for what is essential in the faith. Traditional positions, views commonly held, have to be sustained; but only as a matter of prudence. He should not allow them to be questiond without reason, but there may be a reason for questioning them, and if such be alleged, it should be listened to and its full value allowed. Fairness is the supreme law of a defender of truth, human or divine. It is what most commends truth to inquirer or opponent, and it never can be ultimately harmful to a sacred cause. In times of transition the duty of apologist and theologian is one of extreme delicacy. There are concessions which at first sight seem allowable, but which logically would prove fatal; others considered most dangerous a hundred years ago have since turned out to be harmless. Perhaps the best course to follow, when all is not clear, is to watch and to wait. It is not in keeping with the dignity of religion or its representatives to get excited over every discovery that is claimed to have been made, and every view that may have been ventured upon. Most of them are worthless and soon disappear of themselves; others more plausible are tested by experts and thrown aside. Some prevail, but in a modified form, and generally not unacceptable to orthodoxy. But it takes them time to reach their definitive shape, and in the meantime why should we be concerned religiously with their transient phases? To wait, then, is best. It is the attitude that Catholics generally assumed

during the growth of geological science. While all over Europe and America Protestants were violently denouncing itself and its promotors, Catholics quietly awaited its final evolution, fully prepared to modify their old notions as to the meaning of Genesis and set them in harmony with the new facts, when fully ascertained, and with their logical consequences.

We are told in the Acts that while the Apostles were in prison the Sanhedrim assembled to decide as to how they were to be dealt with, and that Gamaliel, arising in the midst of the Council, gave it as his opinion that they should not be interfered with. He quoted several instances of recent movements which all proved abortive and he added: "Now, therefore, I say to you, refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it."

With a slight alteration of terms we may apply the lesson to ourselves. Be patient and wait. If there is no truth in the facts and views of those scientists, they will come to nought. But if they be true in any measure, in that measure they will ultimately prevail, and ye cannot overthrow them. For, as St. Paul (II Cor. xiii.) says: *We can do nothing against the truth but for the truth.*

J. Hogan.

Boston Ecclesiastical Seminary.

FRANCE'S AID TO AMERICA IN THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.

ONE of the most remarkable facts throwing light upon the American struggle for independence is that the first thought of separation from England, the first conception of a scheme of independence, the first anticipation of a final struggle between England and the colonies, the first utterance of the very word "Independence," and, so to speak, the first declaration, though not a public one, of independence, occurred in France. The struggle began twelve years before the American Declaration of Independence. The struggle during those twelve years cannot be regarded as a revolution. A political revolution is correctly defined to be a great or entire change in the constitution of government, whereas in our struggle the Americans only maintained the ancient and incontestable principles of the British Constitution and their rights thereunder as British subjects. It was the Stamp Act, whereby a British Parliament attempted to impose an unconstitutional tax upon the colonies, that was revolutionary; and, if successfully imposed and submitted to by the Americans, it would have resulted in a radical change or overthrow of the constitution. In going into the struggle, the Americans claimed only their constitutional rights. Independence or separation from Great Britain was far from their thoughts, wishes or intentions. The first blood was shed for their rights under the British Constitution, and not for independence; and the first efforts at negotiation which were made with England were aimed at this end alone. The Americans were loyal citizens of the British Empire, not revolutionists; and it was long after the struggle commenced in 1763 by the peaceful protest of New York—it was fully twelve years thereafter—before Americans thought or spoke of independence. Then the Revolution commenced.

The loyalty of Americans was proclaimed by Otis in the Boston town-meeting of March, 1763, in these energetic words: "We in America have abundant reason to rejoice. The heathen are driven out, and the Canadians conquered. The British dominion now extends from sea to sea, and from the great river to the ends of the earth. Liberty and knowledge, civil and religious, will be co-extended, improved, and preserved to the latest posterity. No constitution in the world has appeared so admirably adapted to these great purposes as that of Great Britain. Every British subject in America is, of common right, by Acts of Parliament, and

by the laws of God and Nature, entitled to all the essential privileges of Britons. By particular charters, particular privileges are justly granted, in consideration of undertaking to begin so glorious an empire as British America. Some weak and wicked minds have endeavored to infuse jealousies with regard to the colonies. The true interests of Great Britain and her plantations are mutual; what God in his providence has united let no man attempt to pull asunder."

Great Britain and her colonies unitedly triumphed over France in America in the Seven Years' War, expelled the French rule from America, and transferred the exclusive sceptre to Great Britain throughout the continent. Conquerors together in a great war, the colonies were proud of their position as an integral part of the British Empire. But British ministers and statesmen did not appreciate the merits of the colonists as supports of the British Empire, although it had been demonstrated in the war just triumphantly ended, nor their loyalty to the Empire, nor their attachment to their constitutional rights, nor their courage and determination to defend them. Hence the insane measures of Parliament, whose leading statesmen and the ministers were intoxicated by the acquisition of so vast an empire in America, in taxing the colonists without representation, and in goading them on to the war of independence.

While the colonists were profoundly loyal, France, on the other hand, was filled with hatred to Great Britain. Humiliated in the Seven Years' War and stripped of her vast possessions in America, her hostility not lessened by the Treaty of Paris, which was a mere formal peace. But France's hostility was nursed only against the mother country. She had no hostility to the colonies, though they had aided Great Britain to drive France out of America. Thus America was loyal, while France was concealing her purpose under diplomatic courtesies, and her first thoughts were how best she could handle the colonies as diplomatic agencies, perhaps military cards, which she could play against Great Britain. Hence the Duke de Choiseul, Minister of the Marine and the Colonies to Louis XV., "predicted to his sovereign," as Mr. George Bancroft says, "the nearness of the final struggle between England and its dependencies, and urged that France should prepare for the impending crisis by increasing its naval force." Such were the French minister's thoughts in 1765; and he was not slow in the following year in taking note of the bold and defiant answer made by the Massachusetts Assembly to its Governor: "The free exercise of our undoubted privileges can never, with any color of reason, be adjudged an abuse of our liberty." In France, at that time, where all popular and constitutional rights were merged in

the royal prerogative, the increasing resistance of the colonies to the British Empire seemed more warlike, more threatening and more revolutionary than it seemed to the colonists themselves.

As early as 1764 Choiseul, having always before his eyes the probability of a new war, or a renewal of the hereditary warfare by England against France and Spain, and looking upon the discontented colonies as the possible allies of France in such an event, sent an agent to America to make a thorough tour of observation through the colonies. This agent, on his return to France, made an elaborate report of the abundant products of the colonies in corn, cattle, flax and iron; in trees fit for masts, in pine timber and other products suitable for peace or war; on their numbers, which were doubled in every twenty years; on their opulence, their warlike character, their consciousness of strength; on the fisheries of the North, on their large construction of ships and their impatience at the restraints imposed upon their navigation; on their cities, the character of their various populations; on the absence of citadels, the condition of the military establishments, accessibility of the cities by water, and, in fact, upon every detail that might interest an enemy of Great Britain. The agent of France reported to the minister that "England must foresee a revolution, and has hastened its epoch by relieving the colonies from the fear of France in Canada."

The watch which the French Ministry constantly kept, not only on the debates and proceedings in the British Parliament, but more especially on the progress of events in the colonies, was such as to portend even in those early years what happened twelve years afterwards—an alliance between the colonies at war with England and France engaged with the same enemy in a general war. In 1767 Choiseul sent over to the colonies as his agent John Kalb, who afterwards became Baron De Kalb and a comrade of Lafayette in our war for liberty, on a similar tour of observation, and he also sought the most accurate information as to the progress of opinion in America and of events, using also for this purpose the writings and speeches of Franklin, the opinions of American merchants, the significant sermons of the New England ministers, and from every source within his reach. While English statesmen were lulled into delusive expectations of submission on the part of the Americans, the French minister read in the signs of the time more accurate information and formed a more correct judgment as to the inevitable struggle. The archives of the State department in France preserve to this day a rare and abundant collection of the most curious American reports, newspaper-cuttings, and extracts of every kind relating to the Revolution. Choiseul conceived the plan and ambition of a great mis-

sion of emancipation, and he dreamed that England's vast colonies were to be erected by the aid of France into mighty independent nations. It must not be supposed that France's only motive in this was self-interest in crippling her enemy. All France even then admired and sympathized with a brave people struggling for liberty.

The contrast, however, between the loyalty of the colonists in seeking redress for their grievances at the hands of the mother country and uninterrupted union with her on the one hand and the diplomacy of France in seeking to widen the breach between them is interesting and suggestive. In 1767, while Franklin, the peaceful agent of the colonies at the Court of England, and Durand, the French ambassador, often met at the Court of St. James. Frequent interviews occurred between them. Not only did Durand make many inquiries of Franklin in regard to the progress of events and the intentions of the Americans; not only did he ask for all of Franklin's political writings, but the Ambassador's conversations with the representative of the colonies must have been very suggestive. Choiseul writing to Durand at London said: "May the anarchy in the British Government last for ages." Durand replied, "Your prayer will be heard;" and Franklin, no doubt pressed by the accomplished diplomatist of the French nation, said: "That intriguing nation would like very well to blow up the coals between Britain and her colonies, *but I hope we shall give them no opportunity.*"

While Franklin was saying this, Durand wrote to the minister at Versailles: "In England there is no one that does not own that its American colonies will one day form a separate State. The Americans are jealous of their liberty, and will always wish to extend it. The taste for independence must prevail among them; yet the fears of England will retard its coming, for she will shun whatever can unite them." Choiseul answered his ambassador: "Let her but attempt to establish taxes in them, and those countries, greater than England in extent, and perhaps becoming more populous, having fisheries, forests, shipping, corn, iron and the like, will easily and fearlessly separate themselves from the mother country." Durand rejoined: "Do not calculate on a near revolution in the American colonies. They aspire not to independence, but to equality of rights with the mother country. A plan of union will always be a means in reserve by which England will shun the greater evil. The loss of the colonies of France and Spain will be the consequence of the revolution of the colonies of England." It is evident that France was at that early date intent on the separation of the colonies from England, for Mr. George Bancroft exclaims, "*The idea* of emancipating the whole colonial world was alluring to Choiseul." Restive under the diplomatic

restraint and caution of Durand, he recalled him, and sent to the Court of St. James his own most confidential friend, the Count de Châtelet, with the purpose of securing greater freedom for himself in his correspondence in relation to the controversy between the colonies and England, the importance of which he clearly discerned. In the meantime Kalb in the colonies was an agent after his own heart, for while he then apprehended an ultimate reconciliation, he did not disguise his views that if the colonies could assemble by deputies and discuss their wrongs and their rights, this would inevitably lead to the formation of an independent state. Upon the merits of the controversy he and those he represented in France sympathized with the colonists; and Kalb said, "Sooner or later, the Government must recognize its being in the wrong."

So steadily did the diplomatic plans of the French Cabinet develop that as early as 1768, ten years before the event took place, we see the earliest traces, and very decided ones they were, of those sentiments and purposes in France which, in 1778, culminated in the solemn treaty of alliance between France and the the United Colonies. In July, 1768, Choiseul held at Paris a conversation of six hours with one who was thoroughly and specially conversant with everything connected with the colonies, and then wrote to Du Châtelet, "My idea, which perhaps is but a reverie, *is to examine the possibility of a treaty of commerce, both of importation and exportation*, of which the obvious advantages might attract the Americans. According to the prognostications of sensible men, who have had opportunity to study their character and measure their progress from day to day, in the event of independence, *the separation of the American colonies from the mètropolis, sooner or later, must come. The plan I propose hastens its epoch.* It is the true interest of the colonies to secure forever their entire liberty and establish their direct commerce with France and the world. We have every reason to hope that the Government on this side will conduct itself in a manner to increase the breach, not to close it up. Such is its way. True, some sagacious observers think it not only possible, but easy, to reconcile the interests of the colonies and the mother country; but the course pursued thus far by the British Government seems to me completely opposite to what it ought to be to effect this conciliation."

Among the instructions sent from Paris to Du Châtelet was the direction to seek information concerning America in London among the merchants who were constantly corresponding with their agents in America, rather than at St. James among officials, and it was evident that he sought the company of Franklin in the city, while the ministers and statesmen of England avoided him. "Franklin," wrote Du Châtelet, "has for years been predicting to

the ministers the necessary consequences of their American measures, but, *fortunately*, is very little consulted." In the meantime, Choiseul continued his consultation with such as knew all about American affairs, and to increase his already huge mass of American newspapers, documents, town resolutions and sermons. There was no public man in England as well acquainted with the state of affairs in and with the resources of the colonies as was the French minister. He wrote, in 1768: "The forces of the English in America are scarcely ten thousand men, and they have no cavalry; but the militia of the colonies numbers four hundred thousand men, and among them several regiments of cavalry. The people are enthusiastic for liberty, and have inherited a republican spirit which the consciousness of strength and circumstances may push to extremities. They will not be intimidated by the presence of troops too insignificant to cause alarm."

When the Americans resolved to purchase no more supplies from England, and the English Cabinet sent out instructions to intercept American vessels, Choiseul wrote to Du Châtelet: "Can the ministry reduce the colonies? Of what avail is an army in so vast a country? The Americans have made these reflections, and they will not give way. To the menace of rigor they will never give way, except in appearance and for a time. The fire will be but imperfectly extinguished." To which Du Châtelet replied: "What a pity that neither Spain nor France is in a condition to take advantage of so critical a conjuncture! Precipitate measures on our part *might reconcile* the colonies to the metropolis; but if the quarrel goes on, a thousand opportunities cannot fail to offer, of which decisive advantage may be taken." While France was thus alert and vigilant, Spain was sluggish and timid; but it is evident throughout that France was better posted in all that concerned America in her relations with England than even England herself. A judicial blindness settled upon England, which all the public proceedings in America and all the enlightened efforts of Franklin at court could not dispel. Contrast the course of French sentiment and cabinet diplomacy on American affairs with the blind folly of the mother country at this very time, 1768, when Parliament rejected the petitions of the Americans and would be satisfied with nothing short of having the colonies at her feet. Choiseul and Du Châtelet could have assured England that this was impossible; but they kept their counsels to themselves, and bided their opportunity. "Without exaggerating the prospects of the union of the colonies"—for now South Carolina had sided with Massachusetts, and the colonists were becoming united—as Châtelet now wrote to Choiseul, "the time of their independence is very near. *Their prudent men believe the time is not yet come,* . . . . but," etc. . . . .

"if the metropolis should persevere, can the union, which is now their strength, be maintained *without succor from abroad?* Even if the rupture should be premature, can France and Spain neglect the opportunity which they may never find again? . . . This new order of things, which will necessarily have the greatest influence on the political affairs of Europe, *will probably be brought about within a very few years.*" Choiseul replied: "Your views are as acute as they are comprehensive and well considered. The king is perfectly aware of their sagacity and solidity, and I will communicate them to the court of Madrid."

Side by side with these "comprehensive and well-considered" views, Englishmen, countrymen of the Americans, reared in the same school of liberty, and speaking the same language, and with the same blood coursing through their veins, were talking loudly of "treason," of "a special commission" to try the leaders under the statute of Henry VIII., and of "condign punishment." While England was thus oppressing her own countrymen she got up a public subscription in aid of the revolting Corsicans, and France threatened to open a subscription for the people of New York. What contrasts does history present! Great, indeed, are the inconsistencies of statesmanship! Free trade between France and America was now urged by Du Châtelet in France and Spain. While Spain hated England, she foresaw that the independence of the English colonies would inevitably lead to that of her own American possessions, and so it did.

During the year 1769 the rivalry of England and France obtruded itself at every turn of European affairs. The French cabinet saw with joy the progress of separation between England and her colonies. "Here is the happy opportunity of dividing the British Empire," were words constantly spoken and written in the diplomatic correspondence. It seemed that the French were only restrained from declaring openly for the colonies by the fear that this might lead to a reconciliation. It became the policy and effort of France to widen the breach, to wait until reconciliation became impossible, and then at last to interfere to prevent England from conquering the colonies by arms. Such was the actual result. In the meantime, however, France and England smothered their mutual hatred under diplomatic intrigues and courtesies, and while the latter continued in America her blind policy of repression, France suffered a reaction in favor of peace, of inactivity in regard to America, if not of alienation; and Choiseul, the friend and admirer of the struggling colonists, was dismissed from office and sent into retirement, in December, 1770, because, as Bancroft says, he was "the friend of colonial independence." The same historian here also exclaims: "Had America then risen,

she would have found no friends to cheer her on." But in all this France was biding her time.

On the other side of the English Channel public policy postponed any open breaking out of hostilities with France while the American colonies were in revolt. George III. said to his minister, Lord North, "We must get the colonies in order before we engage with our neighbors." Thus it was that our struggle for independence entered largely into the affairs of Europe. But the colonies never got "in order." The Declaration of Independence followed the stirring events of the great and momentous struggle which occurred between 1770 and 1776, prominent and critical among which events was the first battle of the war of independence, the battle of Lexington, which occurred on April 19, 1775. During these long and discouraging years the Courts of St. James, Versailles and Madrid carried on a system of dilatory diplomatic tactics, interchanging courtesies, assurances of friendship and contortions of duplicity so transparent to the initiated in diplomacy that one of the actors in this Macchiavellian game thought he could deceive the rest of the world, and especially the American colonists, by stating most graciously that never before had the Courts of St. James, Versailles and Madrid been upon better and more friendly terms.

In the meantime the brave and patriotic colonists embarked single-handed and alone in a struggle for the liberties and rights of mankind that, for purity of motive, singleness of purpose, moderation and justice, enlightened statesmanship, valor in the field, wisdom in the council, and true manhood, has no parallel in the history of the world. Fortunately for the cause of American freedom at that time, the same narrow policy in England, which had driven the colonies to the extremity of war and separation when they sued the mother country for justice and peace, a short-sighted economy had reduced the armaments of England to the most neglected and inefficient condition. England was without allies, as much so as the colonies themselves, and her armies were kept busy in keeping down rebellion at her door in Ireland; and in India Hyder Ali was at war with England, represented by the celebrated Warren Hastings. France and Spain were plotting the overthrow of her whole colonial possessions. In population she was far inferior to her enemies; her navy was not then equal to that of France, and from a military stand-point she virtually admitted her inability to conquer the American colonies by her armies, as was shown by her unworthy efforts to enlist in her military service and in her mercenary pay the soldiers of other countries.

Then George III. gave his final answer to the colonists, refusing peremptorily the redress of their grievances, saying with mock

patriotism, on resorting to arms, "I know what my duty to my country makes me undertake, and threats cannot prevent me from doing that to the utmost extent." Efforts were made to purchase foreign hirelings, low-bred soldiers of fortune, in the markets of the world. Russia, under Catherine II., was the first country that England applied to for hired troops to subdue her own English countrymen in America, and twenty thousand men, disciplined and completely armed and equipped, were asked for; and there England received for answer a most scathing rebuke, which ended with these sarcastic words, which greatly wounded the pride of England: "Moreover," said the Russian Empress, "I should not be able to prevent myself from reflecting on the consequences which would result to our dignity, or that of the two monarchies and the two nations, from this junction of our forces, *simply to calm a rebellion which is not supported by any foreign power.*" France's sympathy for America was shown in the language which, during this unworthy negotiation for Russian troops for the subjection of America, was addressed by Vergennes to the French envoy at Moscow: "I cannot reconcile Catherine's elevation of soul with the dishonorable idea of trafficking in the blood of her subjects." In the next place, King George III. asked a brigade from Holland, and here again his application failed. He next attempted to enlist mercenary foreign troops for conquering America in Germany, and by means of large bounties, high wages and the prospect of booty in the land to be conquered, "crowds of adventurers" and "vagabond veterans" from all parts of Europe flocked to the British standard. There was a law in Germany against enlisting German soldiers for foreign service, but the law was evaded. Recruiting in Germany was afterwards stopped by the protests of the Catholic provinces. England also sought to engage subsidiary troops in Saxony, but the Elector refused to permit it. Brunswick was the next country invaded by the British recruiting agents, and by means alike discreditable to the English king and the Duke of Brunswick, mercenaries for the war in America were procured in Brunswick to the number of five thousand seven hundred and twenty-five during the war. By terms even more disgraceful a contract was made with the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel for twelve thousand Hessian hirelings, and the price was so exorbitant and tempting that the landgrave added four hundred Hessians yagers armed with rifled guns, three hundred dismounted dragoons and three corps of artillery, for all of whom a double subsidy was paid. These soldiers of fortune were further led to believe "that in America they would have free license to plunder and to indulge their passions. These transactions occurred in the latter part of 1775 and the early part of 1776, as, so eager were the

English ministry to obtain these foreign troops by February of the latter year, that they willingly yielded to the most extortionate terms of the Hessian landgrave. The very vastness of these foreign mercenary armies brought over to subdue the colonists proves beyond question, and such is the voice of history, that the American colonists were fully able to conduct the contest against England alone; that, but for these foreign troops, America would have triumphed single-handed in the war of independence without the aid of France. It was the employment of these foreign soldiers which compelled the patriots to seek the aid of France and of the French people. It is to the glory of France that they did not seek in vain. France was America's friend.

Louis XV. died on May 10, 1774, and his grandson, Louis XVI., succeeded him. It is well known that Louis XVI. sympathized from the beginning with the Americans, but from motives of State policy he restrained himself from openly taking their side for some time after he ascended the throne. The queen, Marie Antoinette, was an ardent espouser of the cause of the American patriots, and she warmly advocated the recall to office of Choiseul, "the prophet and favorer of American independence." The differences which Choiseul had had with the king's grandfather, Louis XV., prevented his recall to the ministry, but there were then called to the cabinet Vergennes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Turgot, Minister of Marine, and these enlightened ministers gave practical effect to the deep friendship and sympathy of the French nation for the Americans. But, for the present, the policy of the new governors of France was the policy of peace with England.

Not only the queen but the brothers of Louis XVI. warmly sympathized with America, the nobility generally, and the people. Especially were the people of Paris led on by the wits, philosophers and the influential body of coffee-house politicians, who were men of education, wit and progress, all ardent Americans, regarding the colonists as a brave and noble people contending for the right, maintaining the true principles of the British Constitution and resisting the violence of oppression and subjugation.

In contrast with the sympathies of the French people of every grade we will again cite the diplomatic manner in which the cabinet ministers of Louis XVI. uniformly treated the subject of America in revolt. A prudent reserve marked their treatment of the subject. Even Louis XVI., in October, 1775, said to Lord Stormont, the British ambassador, after George III. and Parliament had finally refused the petition of the colonists and resolved on war, "*Happily*, the opposition party is very weak," alluding to the friends of America in England; and Vergennes, his minister, while using his efforts secretly to widen the breach between England and

America, said to the British ambassador, "Far from wishing to increase your embarrassments, we see them with uneasiness." Wishing to warn the French against the consequences of American independence in its effects on the colonial possessions of other European powers, Lord Stormont said to Vergennes, "The consequences cannot escape a man of your penetration and extensive views." Vergennes then made a prophetic speech in reply as remarkable as it was portentous, and casts in the shade the aspirations of those often-quoted lines in regard to America's future destiny:

> "No pent-up Utica contracts our powers;
> The whole boundless continent is ours."

"Indeed," said Vergennes to Stormont, "the consequences of America's independence are very obvious; they are as obvious as the consequences of the cession of Canada. I was at Constantinople when the last peace was made—the treaty which ended the Seven Years' War between England and France. When I heard its conditions, I told several of my friends there that England would ere long have reason to repent of having removed the only check that could keep the colonies in awe. My prediction has been but too well verified. I equally see the consequences that must follow the independence of North America if your colonies should carry that point at which they now so visibly aim. They might, when they pleased, conquer both your islands and ours. I am persuaded that they would not stop there, but would, in process of time, advance to the southern continent of America, and either subdue its inhabitants or carry them along with them, and in the end not leave a foot of that hemisphere in the possession of any European power. All these consequences will not, indeed, be immediate; neither you nor I will live to see them; but for being remote they are not less sure." This prophecy of the French minister far exceeded in 1775 the Monroe doctrine which an American President uttered in 1823.

Though France and Spain apprehended from the beginning of the struggle that America's independence would ultimately lead to the loss of their own American possessions, they both encouraged and aided the American struggle to success with a view only to its present consequences on England in the inevitable war whose embers were only smouldering. The American subject was never absent from the counsels of the French court and cabinet. As early as July, 1774, nearly a year before the battle of Lexington, Louis XVI. said to his ministers, "Give the leaders of the insurgent party in the British colonies the means of obtaining supplies of war, whilst maintaining the strictest neutrality; develop actively

the navy, and finally, at the first rupture, assemble troops upon the shores of Normandy and Brittany for an invasion of England, so as to force her to concentrate her forces, and thus restrict her means of resistance at the extremities of her possessions."

In the summer of 1775 there arose a party in England who advocated a declaration of war against France as a means of reconciling the American colonies with the mother country, feeling confident such a war would rally the sympathies of the colonists to the mother country. Beaumarchais, the secret and confidential agent of Louis XVI., went to London, had interviews with the American commissioner there, Arthur Lee, and studied the situation of affairs with keen penetration. He hastened back to Versailles and urged the king by a secret memorial, presented by Sartine, to take part in favor of the Americans. "The Americans," he said, "are full of the enthusiasm of liberty, and resolved to suffer everything rather than yield; such a people must be invincible; all men of sense are convinced that the English colonies are lost for the mother country, and I share their opinion." The fear that England would reconcile her colonies by declaring war on France, the appearance of American commissioners in France to solicit French co-operation in the struggle and the urgent appeals of Beaumarchais, brought Louis XVI. and his minister, Maurepas, who was always wavering, to a decision to secretly and indirectly aid the Americans. Beaumarchais, besides his numerous adventures and business enterprises, was now the principal though secret partner in the firm of Rodrigue, Nortalez & Co., and this house became the secret agents of the king and his cabinet for forwarding supplies of every kind to America. The French cabinet advanced to the said firm 1,000,000 livres, about $200,000, and Spain, at the urgent request of Louis XVI., furnished the same sum, for the purpose of sending over to the Americans financial and military aid; and arms and ammunition from the public arsenals of France were also delivered over to them upon condition that they would be paid for by the firm. Beaumarchais' firm thenceforth had extensive business dealings with the secret agents of the American Congress, and though these important supplies were to be paid for by Congress, they were of inestimable service to the patriotic cause of the colonies. The forwarding of supplies through Beaumarchais continued vigorously during the succeeding years, and we shall have occasion to refer again to this precious aid prompted alike by motives of sympathy and commercial profit.

But during these same years there poured forth from France to America a stream of generous, heroic and self-sacrificing sympathy and personal aid, services and labors, which were prompted solely by the love of true liberty as represented by the brave and noble

struggles of our fathers. It was no other than a brother of George III. who was the proximate, though unpremeditated, cause of gaining America some of her best and noblest compatriots. The Duke of Gloucester, a younger brother of King George, in July, 1775, journeyed to France, with the sanction of Louis XVI., and visited the military works at Metz, among other French strongholds, on the eastern boundary of France, and was there received by the commandant, the Count de Broglie, as the guest of Louis. At the dinner given in the fort in honor of King George's brother, there was a guest, a young French nobleman, whose father was killed in his twenty-fifth year in the battle of Minden, leaving this only son an orphan at the age of two years. This young nobleman had been well educated, possessed a generous fortune, had married a gentle, noble and sympathetic young wife at the age of sixteen, and now, at the age of eighteen, he met the Duke of Gloucester at the table of the Count de Broglie, where American affairs were discussed and where he heard of the American struggle for liberty, the retreat of the British from Concord, the surprise at Ticonderoga and of the glorious battles of Lexington and Concord. He there learned that the Americans had declared their independence and were fighting for it. From that moment he became an ally of America and a compatriot of Washington. This was the noble, the generous, the chivalrous, the brave and the heroic Gilbert Motier de Lafayette. He immediately went to Paris, commenced his preparations for going to America, communicated his purpose to Franklin, Deane and Lee, the American Commissioners, and, although the news of the occupation of New York by the British and of Washington's disastrous retreat through the Jerseys after the loss of Fort Washington had just reached Paris, and though his friends urged him to abandon so Quixotic a purpose, as it was regarded, and the American Commissioners honorably declined to encourage his departure at so dark a period of the struggle, he persisted in his generous purpose. When Franklin told him the Commissioners could not even give him a passage to America, he replied that he would purchase a vessel himself to carry him and his companions to America, and that the disastrous condition of the cause of liberty rendered it only the more necessary that a friend of liberty should then go. In the midst of countless oppositions his young and heroic wife encouraged him to go and draw his sword for America and liberty. He eluded all the efforts made by the Courts of St. James and Versailles to prevent his departure; and on learning that the Government, at the instance of England, had given orders for his arrest, he hastened his departure from a port of Spain, though his vessel was not quite ready. Escaping the officers sent to arrest him, and weathering a tempestuous voyage,

he reached America, and was received at Charleston, South Carolina, on April 23d, 1777, with an enthusiasm that baffles description. He was accompanied by eleven French officers, amongst whom was the Baron de Kalb whom I have already mentioned as serving as the French agent of observation in the colonies, for now Lafayette, De Kalb and their companions held military commissions in the French army.

The sensation created in England and France by Lafayette's departure for America was only surpassed by the enthusiasm with which he was received in America. His request to Congress for leave to enter the American army as a volunteer without pay was answered by Congress with a commission as Major-General and by resolutions of exalted eulogy and gratitude. Meeting Washington for the first time at a dinner-party in Philadelphia, he won the General's heart and accepted his invitation to become a member of his staff. The friendship which existed between Washington and Lafayette forms one of the most beautiful evidences that man has God for his Creator. Lafayette served at the battle of Brandywine, where he plunged into the hottest of the fight, was wounded, but refused to see a surgeon until he had rallied the disordered troops, and at the request of Congress was appointed by Washington to command a division of the Continental army. He accepted the command of an expedition to conquer Canada, he shared the sufferings of Washington and his army at Valley Forge, he served the army at the Schuylkill in 1778, and covered himself with glory at the battle of Monmouth. When war broke out in 1778 between England and France he made it a point of honor to return to France and offer his sword to his country, while soliciting permission to return to America, and Congress, in granting him leave of absence, presented him with complimentary resolutions and a sword.

On his return to France he was the object of continuous ovations such as few men have ever received, and in the midst of his triumphal progresses he always had the cause of America first in his mind. It was due to his personal efforts mainly that the army of Rochambeau, which had so potent an effect in securing our independence, was sent to America. Maurepas, the French Prime Minister, said, "It is fortunate for the king that Lafayette did not take it into his head to strip Versailles of its furniture to send to his dear America, as his majesty would have been unable to refuse it." After procuring the aid of men and money in France for America, Lafayette was again with Washington in May, 1780, bringing with him commissions from Louis XVI. appointing Washington a Lieutenant-General in the French army and Vice-Admiral in the French navy. These commissions were an admirable manifestation of the characteristic tact of the French, inas-

much as they conveyed a compliment from the noble French nation to the illustrious Washington, and also, as was intended and afterwards operated, prevented difficulties of official etiquette between the French and American commanders. Washington received Lafayette, who venerated him as a father, to his heart, and Lafayette was the first to communicate to Washington the all-important information of the generous supplies for the war which were soon to follow. Lafayette stood between the covert treason of General Charles Lee at the battle of Monmouth and the cause of the patriots, and between the open treason of Arnold and the colonies in the former's invasion of Virginia. In this latter service the very presence of Lafayette doubled the numbers of the Continental militia flocking to the patriot ranks, and when he arrived at Annapolis with 1200 New England and New Jersey militia, and found his army in great destitution, and without shoes, hats and tents, and the Congress without money or credit to supply them, he purchased for them a full supply with his own money. In many important critical crises during the war Lafayette's prowess was as chivalrous as his military genius was able and skilful, and in times of threatened disaster to the Continental troops in the field he was known to spring from his horse, enter the ranks and rally the retreating battalions by his voice, his example and his daring feats of personal bravery. In Virginia, in 1781, he was so hotly pursued by Cornwallis with greatly superior forces and advantage of position and equipment, that the English general said, "The boy cannot escape me!" but Lafayette, by skill and energy, made good his escape until relieved by Washington, and he soon had Cornwallis in retreat before his own pursuit. The English, who had struggled so hard to prevent his departure from France, now in America made several bold and desperate efforts to surprise and capture him, but he was too alert and bold in his tactics and daring movements ever to be caught. The English generals in America had a special desire to send as a prisoner to England the gallant and heroic young nobleman who had volunteered to fight in the democratic ranks of the struggling young republic. It was Lafayette who drove Cornwallis in turn from his advance on Richmond, and then from the Rappahannock, after the junction with Washington; he forced him towards Williamsburg, after having, by his bold and timely interposition, saved a large quantity of supplies belonging to the Continentals from seizure by the British. He drove Cornwallis across the Jamestown ford, worsting him in a sharp action fought there, and forced him to take shelter and entrench himself at Yorktown, while Lafayette so stationed his army as to cut off his retreat into the Carolinas. Lafayette held Cornwallis pent up in Yorktown until reinforcements arrived from the

North under Washington and Rochambeau, and was thus a leading genius of war in bringing about that military crisis in the war of independence which triumphantly culminated in the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown and the crowning of the patriot struggle in the enduring victory. At the siege of Yorktown Lafayette, in conjunction with General Alexander Hamilton, that grand typical American, both in the field and in the cabinet and in the forum, led one of the gallant and victorious assailing parties that did so much to carry the day, and for his conduct at Yorktown he was publicly thanked by Washington after the surrender of Cornwallis. At the close of this victorious and decisive campaign he returned to France to arouse his country to send further aid to the gallant colonists. Congress, in giving him leave of absence, acknowledged by resolutions his pre-eminent services to the American cause, and directed all American ministers in Europe to confer and correspond with him. Washington had the highest admiration for his personal courage, his skill as a general, and for his great integrity and prudence. At Monmouth, when Charles Lee was stealthily betraying the American cause on the battle-field, and Lafayette was thwarting his covert and wicked designs, he said to him, "Sir, you do not know British soldiers; we cannot stand against them." Lafayette answered, "It may be so, General; but British soldiers have been beaten and they may be again; at any rate I am disposed to make the trial." He indignantly resented and thwarted every effort which came to his knowledge that was hostile to Washington, showing on all occasions an ideal and chivalrous loyalty to his chief. He effectively interposed to prevent or remove all misunderstanding between Count D'Estaing and his army and the American army.

On his return to France, after the surrender of Cornwallis, France became ablaze with enthusiasm for the American cause, and the flame crossed the Pyrenees and set the Spanish heart on fire. Lafayette marched with 8000 French soldiers from Brest to Cadiz, and an expedition of sixty vessels and 24,000 troops was organized to sail from Cadiz for America under the command of Lafayette. Shortly after his arrival at Cadiz he received tidings of the conclusion of peace at Paris. He immediately sent a letter from Cadiz, February 5, 1783, to Congress, and he was the first to communicate to America the glad tidings of peace, as he had been the first of Frenchmen to draw the sword in war for the cause of liberty in America.

It is not known how much of his revenues or his fortune he expended in the cause of America, but it was great. His hereditary fortune was confiscated in his own country during the Reign of Terror, and he who, in 1783, passed through France a conqueror

and a hero, whose request brought fleets and armies under his command as the champion of American freedom, was reduced to poverty by the frantic action of his own countrymen. In 1784 Washington invited Lafayette to visit America. He accepted joyfully so grateful an invitation, and almost immediately on his arrival in New York, on August 4th, he proceeded to Mount Vernon, where Washington and Lafayette communed in the highest and purest offices of personal friendship and exalted mutual admiration. Lafayette subsequently visited Annapolis, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Albany and Boston, and he received everywhere the highest and most ardent testimonials of gratitude, affection and admiration. In December, when he departed for his home, Congress appointed a solemn deputation of one member of Congress from each State in the Union to salute and take leave of him in the name of a grateful nation. In 1824 Congress again, by an unanimous resolution, requested President Monroe to invite Lafayette to visit America, and a ship of the line was placed at his disposal for the voyage. In accepting the invitation he courteously declined the use of the ship, and with his son and secretary he took passage on a packet-ship and arrived at New York on August 15, 1824. His progress through the country was one uninterrupted triumphal procession. As the guest of the nation he visited each of the twenty-four States and the chief cities. Congress voted him a grant of $200,000 and a township, 24,000 acres, of the public lands, "in consideration of his important services and expenditures during the American Revolution." On September 7, 1825, he sailed from Washington in a Government frigate, which, in compliment to him, was named the Brandywine, for his native country, where a demonstration in his honor was dispersed by the French police.

The gratitude of America to Lafayette has been, is, and ever will be, unbounded, worthy at once of a great benefactor and of a great nation. Unbounded gratitude is the debt which America owes to Lafayette; he has nobly deserved it, and America has honorably paid the debt of gratitude. His name is coupled with that of Washington; his portrait or statue is in almost every capitol, State-house and public or private gallery; cities and counties in every State are named in his honor. His public and private virtues and his public services have also deserved well of his native country. Lafayette is not held in higher, if as high, veneration and gratitude in France as he is in America. It was a touching incident when lately a member of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution sought out the modest tomb of Lafayette in France, and reverently placed over the sacred remains of America's friend an American flag. The same Society, at its recent annual

banquet and symposium, made the services of Lafayette and his compatriots, the French alliance and the aid France rendered to our cause, the special and sole objects and subjects of their celebration, and the banquet was held on the anniversary of the French-American Alliance of 1778.

It would be a pleasing tribute and a labor of love if we could give space in this impromptu paper to each and every one of the compatriots of Lafayette who aided our fathers in the great and noble struggle for independence, and recount also in each case the special services they rendered to the American cause. Our space does not permit us to render this grateful office. But we can and will at least mention their names, and may have opportunity of making particular reference to some of them before concluding this feeble tribute to our French allies. We would, therefore mention such honored names among these ever-gallant friends, most of whom served in America and only a few rendered services in France, as those of Admiral Count Louis de Barros, Pierre Auguste de Beaumarchais, the Abbé Bandoles, Chaplain de la Barrher, M. de Beville, General Claude Blanchard, M. Blaskowitz, Chevalier du Boucher, Chevalier de Castellux, General M. de Choisy, Count de Caustive, M. D'Abonville, General Jean de Barth, the Prince de Broglie, Colonel Louis E. de Corny, Admiral Count D'Estaing, Admiral Count de Grasse, Baron John de Kalb, Major De Prez, Admiral Detouches, Admiral Count de Ternay, Count Christian Deux-Ponts, Colonel Count Arthur de Dillon, Lieutenant Pierre Donville, Chevalier de Fayolle Dudonpeare, Count de Dumas, Peter Stephen Duponceau, Chevalier de Dupontail, M. Falcourt, a banker; Marquis de Fleury, Colonel Genet, Professor Jean E. Guilbert, M. de Journencourt, Duke de Lauzun, Marquis de Malmedy, the Minister Maurepas, Charles Vincent, Viscount de Maurri, Baronde Montesquieu, Marquis de Loval Montmorenci, Marquis de Noailes, ambassador; Viscount de Noailes, Maxime Outray, M. de Piroude, M. Bisançon, Count Casimer Pulaski, a Pole, but who came to us from France, and gave his life to our cause from wounds received in the attack on Savannah; M. Robelleau, Charles Surgen, Abbé Robin, General Count Rochambeau, General Armand Rouerie, Count de Segur, Lieutenant Chevalier de Silly, Chevalier de Sonneville, Baron Frederick William Augustus Steuben, a German, but coming to us from France at the instance, Count St. Germain; M. Joseph Tarlé, commissary; M. de Tilley, M. de Touche, Colonel Tousard, M. de Vandreuil, Count de Vergennes, cabinet minister of Louis XVI.; Baron de Viomeiul, M. Dugan, M. Arendal, Chevalier de St. Aulaire, Antoine Felix Viebert, Louis Dubois, Chevalier de Kermoroan, Jacque de Franchessen, Saint Martin, Jean

Arthur de Vermont, Fidele Doré, Christophe Pellissiere, Jacque Paul Govert, Chevalier du Plessis Manduit, Jean Louis Imbert, Chevalier de Colernes, Jean Louis de Virnejoux, Pierre Francis de Boys, Mat. Al de la Rochefermoy, Count de Montfort, M. de la Neuville, M. de Faneuil, Charles Armond Tupin, Mattin de la Balme, Coppin de la Garde, M. de Vallenays, Chevalier Duportail, M. de la Radiere, M. de Gouvion, M. Dupont, M. M. Dupont, Baron de Holzendorf, M. Prudhomme de Borre, Ironson de Cordrai, Chevalier de Failly, M. Des Espinieres, M. Nicolas Roger, M. de Bedaux, M. de Vrigny, Chevalier de Brisson, Chevalier de La Colombe, Chevalier Dorset, M. de Laumoi, Chevalier Villefranche, M. Denis de Bouchet, M. Ferdinand de Brahm, M. de Ponthiere, M. de Ponceaux, M. Du Chambray, Marquis de Vienne, M. Bechet de Rochefontaine, M. de l'Eglise, M. Touzar, M. Brice, M. de Neville, M. de Pongibeau, Chevalier de Cremis. The following were raised to the rank and command as major-general: Rouerie, Fleury, Du Portail, Pulaski, De Kalb, Mauduit, De Gernet, Bouchet and Touzar, the last of whom lost an arm in battle. Several of the distinguished French noblemen who fought for liberty in America under Washington afterwards lost their lives in France in defense of the person and rights of King Louis XVI., as the King of France under the constitution of the French monarchy.

Diplomatic correspondence between Versailles and London continued. While in England many urged a war with France, in order to bring back the colonies to the mother country, Vergennes wrote: "The English cabinet is greatly mistaken if it thinks we regret Canada; they may themselves regret having made its acquisition." Louis XVI. now found a most trusty agent to send to America in Bonvouloir, a French gentleman who had just passed through the colonies, and with ample instructions he was sent to America. Vergennes wrote to De Guines at London: "The King very much approves the mission of Bonvouloir. His instructions should be verbal and confined to the two most essential objects: the one to make you a faithful report of events and of the prevailing disposition of the public mind; the other to secure the Americans against jealousy of us. Canada is for them the object of distrust. They must be made to understand that we do not think of it at all, and that, far from envying the liberty and independence which they labor to secure, we admire the nobleness and the grandeur of their efforts, have no interest to injure them, and shall with pleasure see happy circumstances place them at liberty to frequent our ports; the facilities which they will find there for their commerce will soon prove to them our esteem." Already the principles of the French Revolution had begun to shake the throne of France, and

Turgot was the first to sacrifice himself to them when he was dismissed from the cabinet.

Vergennes and Sartine in the cabinet continued to favor the Americans. "If the navy of France," said Sartine to the king, "were at this moment able to act, France never had a fairer opportunity to avenge the insults of the English. I beseech your majesty to consider that England, by its most cherished interests, its national character, its form of government and its position, is and always will be the true, the only and the eternal enemy of France. . . . . Your minister would be chargeable with guilt if he did not represent to your majesty the necessity of adopting the most efficacious measures to parry the bad faith of your natural enemies." All this ministerial pressure was for war with England and aid to America. When Beaumarchais complained of the delay in France in aiding the Americans, Vergennes replied, "Do not think advice rejected because it is not eagerly adopted; all slumber is not lethargy." This was followed by an announcement of the French Court, through its agent Beaumarchais to Arthur Lee, the American Commissioner, in the early summer of 1776, that the subsidy to America would be increased, and that they promised the Americans two hundred thousand louis d'ors, which was nearly one million dollars. Before the end of the year the American Declaration of Independence led to the first official intercourse between the American Commissioners at Paris and the French Government, and the former were assured of the unanimous good wishes of the government and people of France, and that it was not the interest of France to see them reduced by force. At the request of the American Commissioner two hundred light brass field-pieces and arms and clothing for twenty-five thousand men were promised, and Beaumarchais offered merchandise on credit to the value of three millions of livres. Vergennes made a powerful appeal to Louis XVI. towards the last of August, 1776, in cabinet, in the presence of Maurepas, Sartine, St. Germain and Clugny, in favor of war with England and an alliance with America. But the Kings of France and Spain were opposed to open hostilities, and yet the vessels of the Americans and their privateers were received and harbored in French and Spanish ports in spite of England's constant protests. In the meantime the Declaration of Independence united the English at home and almost silenced the opposition to the policy of the conquest of America. But the struggle so far had been favorable to the colonists, who had expelled the British from New England and repulsed them from South Carolina. In January, 1776, Franklin joined the American Commissioners at Paris. While the request of Franklin for eight ships of the line, ammunition, brass field-pieces and twenty or thirty thousand mus-

kets was declined, warm promises of aid were given; half a million of livres was to be paid to the American Commissioners quarterly, three vessels laden with warlike stores were allowed to go to sea, and a million of livres additional were advanced on a contract with the farmers-general for fifty-six hogsheads of American tobacco. With professions of peace France was waging war in disguise on England. Pulaski followed Lafayette and De Kalb to America; ships were continually leaving French ports for America. British remonstrances were evaded by the cunning of Vergennes, who in return protested against the seizure of American property in mid-ocean. The American Commissioners tried in vain to commit Spain to openly siding with the Americans, and while she opposed American independence she secretly aided America, making France her almoner.

In the meantime the Americans were actually winning their independence under Washington with the Continental armies; the campaigns of 1776 and 1777 resulted in signal successes for their cause, and the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga seemed almost decisive. But this again was followed by Washington's retreat through the Jerseys and his famous winter of suffering at Valley Forge. The diplomacy of years seemed now about to bear its fruit. Franklin, Deane and Lee, at Paris, were indefatigable, and now we see them deliberately discussing a Franco-American Treaty with Vergennes; and on February 6, 1778, the Solemn Treaty of Alliance between France and the United States was signed by Gerard in behalf of France and by Benjamin Franklin, Silas Deane and Arthur Lee for the United States. Three solemn treaties were in fact signed between France and America on that day. The first was a general treaty of friendship and commerce; the second was the great and important treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, by which France and America made common cause in the war against England; and the third was a secret treaty by which the right was reserved to the King of Spain to become a party to the two foregoing treaties. These treaties were followed by a declaration of war by France against England, and the sending of a French Ambassador to the Republican Government, then sitting at Philadelphia, by a French fleet.

After the news of Burgoyne's surrender reached Europe, Frederick the Great, of Prussia, said, "The chances are one hundred to one that the colonies will sustain their independence," and he openly expressed his sympathy for them. His minister wrote to the American Commissioners at Paris, "The King desires that your generous efforts may be crowned with complete success. He will not hesitate to recognize your independence when France, which is more directly interested in the event of this contest, shall

have given the example." Louis XVI., who had been nervous over the popularity of Franklin at court, now joined in the general joy, and in January, 1778, a month before the treaty was signed, he promised three millions of livres. By the treaty of commerce, each party was to be placed on the footing of the most favored nations. The King of France promised his good offices with the princes and powers of Barbary. Liberal provisions were made in regard to the fisheries, and the American contention that free ships give freedom to goods and to persons, except to soldiers in actual service of an enemy, was adopted. The absolute and unlimited independence of the United States was announced as the essential object of the defensive alliance, and both parties agreed not to lay down their arms until assured of peace by treaties terminating the war. In 1843, when the Prince Joinville visited America, he went to see Eleazer Williams, the reputed son of Louis XVI. and of Marie Antoinette, Dauphin of France, Louis XVII., who was said to have been abstracted from his revolutionary prison in Paris and brought to America by an agent of the royal family. At this time he was a missionary of the Episcopal Church among our Northern Indians, amongst whom he had been reared. It is said that Joinville offered him a large sum of money if he would renounce his claim to the French throne, and that he refused. In this interesting person the French prince, reversing the received historical version of the relations of Louis XVI. and Vergennes to the American struggle, said, "The King encountered an opposition from the Count de Vergennes and the Court when he took the suffering cause of the Americans in hand. He was moved by the representations of the American Commissioners, and the Queen was no less urgent to save the sinking cause of the American people. My grandfather and my father were present when the last struggle took place between the King and the ministry upon the articles of the alliance with the United Colonies of America. That day—it was a happy day for the Americans, but for the King, it was the day of his death. Yes; that day, when the King put his name to the instrument he sealed his death-warrant." Again he said, "But for those powerful aids no monuments are raised to perpetuate his memory. Louis XVI. ought to be placed next to George Washington as a liberator of the American people." When urged by the English Cabinet to reconsider his acts, Louis XVI. said, "No consideration in life shall make me stoop to opposition. I will rather risk my crown than do what I think personally disgraceful. If the nation will not stand by me they shall have another king, for I will never put my hand to what will make me miserable to the last day of my life." The alliance was followed on March 20, 1778, by the presentation of the American

Commissioners at Court, and the King said to them, "I wish Congress to be assured of my friendship." After the ceremony the Commissioners visited the wife of Lafayette, and dined with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and two days later they were presented to Marie Antoinette, who, yielding to the most generous impulses in behalf of the Americans, made their cause the ruling passion of the French Court, as it had been of Paris and of the French nation. George Bancroft expresses the same sentiment with the Prince de Joinville, when he says, "Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, when they embarked for the liberation of America, pleasure on the prow and the uncertain hand of youth at the helm, might have cried out to the new Republic which they fostered, 'Morituri te salutant,' 'The doomed to die salute thee.'" On May 4th Congress unanimously ratified the treaties, expressing the "wish that the friendship so happily commenced between France and the United States might be perpetual," and the King of France was proclaimed "the protector of the rights of mankind." At Valley Forge, Washington and Lafayette and the Continental army celebrated this great event on May 6th by a salute of thirteen guns, a running fire of all the musketry, and the army, drawn up in two lines, shouted, "Long live the King of France!" "Long live the friendly European powers!" and, as our historian records, "the ceremonies were closed by a huzza for the American States."

In the meantime Beaumarchais, the agent of Louis XVI. and of his cabinet, was actively prosecuting the work of forwarding aid to America. In 1777 he forwarded three of his own ships, carrying 200 pieces of ordnance, 25,000 muskets, 200,000 pounds of gunpowder and other ammunition. He engaged the services of fifty accomplished officers, amongst whom were La Rouerie, Pulaski and Steuben. Several other ships were sent out during this year, and the disbursements of Beaumarchais reached by September 5,000,000 francs. Congress was under the impression that these supplies were gifts from the French Government, and never thought of making remittances to Beaumarchais, who consequently became embarrassed, but was reimbursed by the advance of another million of francs by the French Government. Beaumarchais continued his advances to America, and in 1779 as many as ten vessels sailed at one time for the colonies, though few of them reached their destination. At that time Congress was in his debt as much as 4,000,000 francs. America readily acknowledged her obligations; she was without the means of paying them then; but she redeemed her honor, for although the payment of the claim met with obstacles, the claim was finally and fully paid, and the final settlement was made with Beaumarchais' heirs, in 1835, by the payment of the final balance of 800,000 francs.

France made good her alliance, offensive and defensive, with the United States. She was now engaged as the ally of America in an offensive and defensive war against England. It is no part of our writing to follow in detail the history of that war, nor to repeat what all our histories contain, the operations of the naval and military forces of France against the English armies and navies in America. On the eighth of July, 1778, a French fleet, under Count D'Estaing, arrived in American waters. It was at D'Estaing's persuasion that Marie Antoinette proposed and secured the preparation and despatch of this powerful fleet to America, which consisted of twelve ships of the line and three frigates. In August Congress received with every honor Conrad Alexander Gerard, the French ambassador, and expressed the nation's acknowledgement of "the hand of a gracious Providence in raising them up so powerful a friend." When Lafayette arrived at Versailles, in February, 1779, Marie Antoinette eagerly asked him, "Tell me good news of our dear republicans, of our beloved Americans?" Gerard wrote from America to Vergennes, "I have had many conversations with General Washington. . . . . I have formed as high an opinion of the powers of his mind, his moderation, his patriotism and his virtues, as I had before from common report conceived of his military talents and of the incalculable services he had rendered to his country." Congress solicited portraits of the King and Queen of France. The naval operations of the French fleets under D'Estaing and De Grasse, the military operations of Rochambeau's army of six thousand French soldiers, the eagerness of the French soldiers to serve under Washington, the brilliant achievements of the French armies, the victories of De Grasse, the united operations of the French and Colonial armies, the glorious campaigns they fought together, their victories over the British armies, the culmination of the struggle at Yorktown, the co-operation of the French fleet at Yorktown, the victory of Yorktown the result of American and French valor, prowess and skill; the surrender of Cornwallis to Washington at Yorktown, the end of the war, and, above all, Peace, with independence, are all subjects for the general historian. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to detail all the services rendered by France to the cause of American independence. The Prince de Joinville has stated in general terms that France, in the American Revolution, lost thirty-five thousand men and twenty-five ships of the line. And Mr. Stone, in his book on "Our French Allies," mentions that the expenditure of the Government of Louis XVI. in aid of the Americans had been estimated at 400,000,000 livres. An accomplished American naval officer, an author and leading authority on naval historical subjects, in his scholarly and exhaustive book "Influence of Sea Power Upon

History," says: "Will it be too much for American pride to admit that, had France refused to contest the control of the sea with England, the latter would have been able to reduce the Atlantic seaboard? Let us not kick down the ladder by which we mounted, nor refuse to acknowledge what our fathers felt in their hour of trial. The successful ending of the struggle for independence was due to the control of the sea—to sea-power in the hands of the French, and its improper distribution by the English authorities."

Would it not be more correct historically to say that it was by combination, union and co-operation of the French naval forces with the land forces under the able, brilliant and untiring military prowess of Washington, with the aid of the French officers and soldiers, that, under Providence, achieved the Independence of America?

RICHARD H. CLARK, LL.D.

Scientific Chronicle.

REFINEMENTS OF MODERN MEASUREMENTS.

THE word "measure" in ordinary language is mostly restricted to the evaluation of space and time; as when, for example, we say that a stick measures 4 feet in length, a floor measures 500 square feet, a block of stone measures 2 cubic yards, a cask 40 gallons, that a day is 24 hours *long*, though we know that for many people it measures but little in breadth, and still less in depth.

Among scientists the word has a far more comprehensive meaning. With them "to measure" is to ascertain the amount, or quantity, of anything whatsoever, provided that quantity can be expressed in figures. Thus, we measure force (under which is included weight), energy, heat, light, magnetism, electricity, vibrations of all kinds, etc. But though we recognize differences of degree, we do not, according to the scientific acceptation of the word, measure thoughts, or affections, or emotions.

Few people are aware how much the progress of practical science depends on the possibility of exact measurements, and to what a degree of refinement these measurements have been pushed in modern times.

Though we use the term "exact measurement," yet no scientist will claim that any measurement ever made can be proved to be *absolutely* exact. For example, let us take the simplest kind of a case, say the linear measurement of a rod of brass.

Now, one man, using the best instruments that are to be had, will measure it a dozen, or a score, of times, with all possible precautions as to changes of temperature and of atmospheric pressure, etc., and will get a different result every time. They may not differ much, but they will differ at least by some small amount. The experimenter will then take the average of all these determinations, and will find a length say of 11.2386 inches. Though he knows he is very near, he will not say that is the true length, but will express his doubt by writing $11.2386 + .0001$, which means that the value of the last decimal must be somewhere between the limits of 5 and 7. It may, indeed, be just 6, but is not necessarily so. A true scientist never says a thing is so unless he be perfectly sure of it.

Another man equally skilled, with the same instruments, and using all the same precautions, and going over his work at least an equal number of times, might get $11.23857 + .00002$, so that the last figure of the result might be anywhere between 5 and 9. The results obtained by these two men might or might not, according to circumstances, be deemed very close, but it is evident that they could not be called absolutely exact. In the strict sense of the word, no measurement of anything can ever be called absolutely exact.

With this we pass to the real object of this note, which is to mention briefly some few of the refinements of modern measurements.

(1) *Mechanical Measurements.*—As an example of precision in purely mechanical measurements we may instance the Dividing Engine, which has been brought to its latest degree of perfection by Professor Rowland, of Baltimore. The purpose of this machine is to rule, on glass or metal, fine parallel lines, very close together, and this it does automatically. The plates so ruled are called "diffraction gratings," and are used in optical work for obtaining the "spectrum." This they do more perfectly than the prisms of glass or other material formerly employed for that purpose. The ruling is done by a diamond pen, which must be adjusted as perfectly as is possible to human skill and patience. It is stated that it once took the persistent efforts of eighteen months to get a pen finally set, so as to buckle down to its work reliably. Well, that machine will do pretty fine work. Its latest, and we believe its best, job has been the ruling of a grating having the number of 114,000 lines to the inch.

To get an idea of what that means let us change the scale a little, so that we may get a grip on it. Take a length of 100 feet; that is something tangible. If that distance were divided into 114,000 equal parts there would be just 95 divisions to each inch, and the $\frac{1}{95}$ of an inch is barely visible to the naked eye. But the spacings on that grating are 1200 times as small. We talk about a hair's breadth as the type of things small, but a hair laid on that grating, parallel with the lines, would cover hundreds of them. Moreover, those lines are known to be accurately spaced, since the least irregularity would immediately manifest itself by a blur on the spectrum. It is evident that such accuracy as this can be had only by the utmost refinements of measurements in the working parts of the machine, and so delicate is it that when it is in use a very slight change in the temperature of the room will completely ruin the result. For this reason it is kept in an underground apartment, and when started up the room is locked and the machine left to take care of itself, for even the heat radiated from the human body would distract its attention from its work and cause it to run irregularly.

Can human accuracy go further in this line? We know not, but we do know that there is still left some room for improvement. If we take the most probable size calculated for a molecule of a gas, we find that it would require at least 50 of them to build a bridge across from one of the lines of the grating to the next. So we are not down to the molecule yet, and we do not intend to stop trying till we get there, or mayhap a little beyond.

(2) *Angles.*—As a sample of the measurement of angles, let us take a disk 1 inch in diameter. In a good light it would be barely visible to the unaided eye at a distance of 500 feet, while at a distance of 1000 feet it would be for us as one of the things that are not. At this latter distance the visual angle subtended by the disk would be about the $\frac{1}{2\,4\,0}$ of a degree, or $\frac{1}{4}$ of a minute, of angular measurement. At 1000 miles

distance the visual angle would be only about $\frac{1}{1,080,000}$ of a degree, or $\frac{1}{300}$ of a second, in angle measurement, and that is just about the angle that the Darwin pendulum will measure with certainty and precision. This satisfies most of our yearnings in this direction.

(3) *Expansion and Stretching.*—The "Mirror Testing-Apparatus," lately invented in New York, is designed to measure the expansion or stretching of metals under the influence of heat or strain. It consists essentially of two little mirrors attached to two knife-edges in such a way that any change in the position of the knife-edges causes the mirrors to turn more or less. This device is clamped at points between which the elongation is to be measured. The deflections of the mirrors are observed through a small telescope from a distance of several feet, and are referred to a scale ruled by a dividing engine to the $\frac{1}{100,000}$ of an inch. The instrument is capable of detecting changes of length due to exceedingly minute variations of temperature, and of accurately measuring the strain caused by the foot-fall of a pedestrian in crossing the Brooklyn Suspension Bridge.

(4) *The Bolometer.*—This instrument, invented by Professor Langley, of the Smithsonian Institute, is an excessively delicate electrical thermometer. A description would be quite unintelligible without figures, and we shall have to content ourselves by stating that it will measure the heat supplied us by the moon, and even that due to the stars and comets. In a word, it will reveal a difference of the $\frac{1}{4000}$ of a degree Fahrenheit.

(5) *The Galvanometer.*—The unit of measurement for electrical currents is called an "ampere." The ordinary incandescent lamp of 16-candle power is run by about ½ an ampere. Our best galvanometers will detect and measure a current which has only the $\frac{1}{27,000,000}$ part of that strength. Two different substances that are at different temperatures always present some difference in their electrical conditions, but the difference is extremely small. If the substances are as near alike as two peas from the same pod, the difference of their electrical condition must therefore be an almost vanishing quantity, and yet it may be measured. Any two contiguous fingers of the human hand are surely very nearly alike, as far as their substance goes, and their temperature, under any ordinary circumstances, must be almost the same; but the galvanometer spoken of above will reveal that there is a difference and will register its exact amount.

(6) *Lenses.*—In certain microscopes the curvature of the lenses is so slight that no human eye could detect it. And no wonder for that, since the surface differs from a perfect plane by less than $\frac{1}{150,000}$ of an inch, and that curvature, little as it is, must be truly spherical, otherwise the images would be distorted, and distortion of an image in a microscope is like a lie in man, something sinful and essentially bad in itself, and moreover sure to be discovered sooner or later.

(7) *Pressure.*—The atmosphere which surrounds us, and in which we live and move and have our being, exerts a pressure of about 15 pounds per square inch on all surfaces exposed to it. We are not aware of this pressure through our senses, partly because it is even, inside and out,

and partly because we are built precisely in a way so as not to feel it. Any change, however, in that pressure is soon perceived. Now Professor Crookes, in the prosecution of certain experiments in electricity, succeeded in reducing that pressure down to the $\frac{1}{20,000,000}$ of its original value, while, quite lately, Professor Dewar has pushed the exhaustion yet a little further, even down to the $\frac{1}{25,000,000}$ of an atmosphere. Nor are these figures mere guess-work; they are accurately registered by the gauge, and the gauge itself is proved to be perfectly reliable.

(8) *Weighings.*—Take two lumps of wood or metal, the one weighing a pound, the other fifteen ounces. Now, you could not, by "hefting" them (as our New England cousins say), tell them apart, and probably you have not a friend in the world who could. The difference between them is $437\frac{1}{2}$ grains. What chance would you then have of deciding between two weights that differ by only a single grain? Yet a good chemical balance is expected to weigh down to the $\frac{1}{7000}$ of a grain, and if decently handled it will do so.

(9) *Attraction.*—The weight of a body is due to the combined attractions of all the particles of matter in the earth for the particles of the body, and is the measure of that attraction. How infinitesimal then must be the attraction of one single grain of matter! And, still, Professor Boys claims to be able with a very simple arrangement, consisting of a thread of glass, or, better, quartz, and a tiny bit of mirror, to detect and measure the attractive force of the $\frac{1}{20,000,000,000}$ of a grain.

The above list might be considerably extended, but we think we have said enough to show that the refinements of measurements of modern times are really something marvellous. The question now occurs: "What is the use of it all?" To answer this question in detail would be to write the history of all the applied sciences over again, and add thereto a large dose of prophecy, the latter occupying probably more place than the former. We have no intention to embark on any such an undertaking. Suffice it to say that we owe the success of our steam-engines, and dynamos, and electric motors, and telegraphs, and telephones, and typewriters, and telescopes, and a thousand other things, without which life in these days would seem impossible, to just such refinements in measurements as we have enumerated, and to them we shall owe whatever progress is to be made in the future along these and other lines perhaps as yet undreamed of. To be thankful for what has already been given us is a good way to make sure of getting more.

THAT UNLUCKY NUMBER, THIRTEEN.

We still occasionally meet with persons who believe that ill-luck ever dogs the footsteps of the number thirteen. If it finds its way unbidden, or even unnoticed, into any of our affairs, it is disastrous; if introduced knowingly, it betokens a catastrophe. Although the superstition has time and time again been transfixed with the arrows of ridicule, and riddled with the bullets of argument, and pounded into a shapeless mass with the hammers of experiment, it manages somehow or other,

every now and then, to scramble itself together again, to mend up its breaches, and to sally forth anew to the great terror of women and—and female men. A consideration of the following points may be of some use to those who are suffering from this sort of neuralgic hallucination:

That the number of the "Original States" was thirteen was, of course, a piece of pure chance; but even at that, the event should have proved disastrous. It really does not seem to have had such an issue. Starting from that original thirteen, and founded on it, we find a frequent use made of the number, in an emblematic way, especially by the Federal Government.

The national flag was originally of thirteen stars and thirteen stripes. The stars have grown to forty-five, but the stripes remain the same. The adoption of the thirteen stars and stripes was intentional; it should, therefore, have proved a catastrophe. We find no evidence of any such thing.

But, worse than all this, we have lying before us a quarter dollar. It is the only one we have, and even it is a borrowed one. It bears the date of 1893. On it the number thirteen has been repeated, and multiplied, and concentrated, and condensed. Thus, there are thirteen stars on the obverse and thirteen on the reverse of the piece—thirteen feathers in each distinct section of the eagle's wings—thirteen feathers in his tail—thirteen vertical and thirteen horizontal lines on his pinafore, or shield—he grasps a bundle of thirteen arrows in one claw, and in the other a branch of some undetermined plant, but, anyhow, bearing thirteen leaves. Stranger yet, the scroll, "*E pluribus unum*," is of thirteen letters; and the very name of the piece, "Quarter Dollar," is also made up of thirteen letters.

On the obverse we read the motto: "IN GOD WE TRUST." Here we have only twelve letters; but we once, long ago, saw with our own eyes, and handled with our own hands, and showed to our acquaintances, a coin bearing the inscription "IN GOLD WE TRUST," thus rounding out the full number, thirteen. It was a new piece, received without any doubt as to its genuineness, and, either supposing that it was of the first batch from a new set of dies, and that it would soon be common, or else, laboring under a stress of poverty, or of a fresh burst of honesty, we parted with it, *unluckily*, for we never fell in with another one of the kind since.

The dying man grasps at a straw, and this dying superstition will probably find a straw to grasp at in the troubles, financial and political, of the past few years, and will attribute them all to the unlucky thirteen of our coinage. However, in spite of all the ill-luck hovering over the number thirteen, and in spite of its manifold repetition on our silver quarters, in order to prove that we have the courage of our convictions, we stand ready to brave the consequences of receiving all such quarters as any or all of our readers may wish to throw away. If that is not true courage, please tell us what is.

AMBERGRIS.

There are still a good many mysteries in the world, but it seems that

the number has lately been reduced by at least one, that one being the "Origin of Ambergris."

In the "Scientific Chronicle" of this REVIEW for January, 1895, we remarked, in a casual way, that "Ambergris is formed in the intestines of the sperm whale, *and is believed to be a diseased product.*" If we may credit an account given a short time ago, in a Boston newspaper, and which has even found its way into the scientific journals, the doubt timidly hinted at in the above quotation is at last fairly set at rest.

According to this account, a whaling vessel, hailing from Cape Cod, during a cruise in Southern waters on a beautiful, sunny afternoon, fell in with three whales that appeared to be out on a holiday. Two of them were fine specimens of whale-flesh, fat and plump, and, rejoicing in their strength, with a good conscience, and a better appetite, they played and gamboled in the warm waters, and enjoyed themselves hugely, as only whales can do, unobservant of the danger lurking so near. The third one seemed to take no interest in the amusements of his companions, nor even in the beauties of the scenery around and above him, but rolled listlessly with the gentle swellings of the sea. He was lank and scrawny, and apparently half starved to death.

This seemed strange to the sailors, who knew that first-class whale-food, in the shape of the delightful cuttle-fish, was especially abundant at that time and place. However, their business was not so much to theorize as to lay in a plentiful supply of oil. They knew, moreover, that a good sperm whale would yield from fifty to one hundred barrels, while from this lean specimen they could hardly hope to get enough to keep the ship's lamps burning during the home voyage. Having put out the boat, they therefore bore down on the two sleek monsters, and with good luck, backed up by unerring aim, they slew and captured both. The scraggy specimen made no attempt to get away, and was left still lazily rocking in the sea.

The next day, to the amazement of the sailors, he was seen in nearly the same spot. Thereupon a council was held in the forecastle. Some of the sailors maintained that, since the whale did not make his escape when free to do so, it meant that he had been crossed in love, and therefore did not consider life worth living any longer, and so wanted to be gathered to his fathers and be at rest. Others just as stoutly maintained that, having witnessed the slaughter of his companions, if left alive

> "He would tell the sad tales
> To the rest of the whales,"

and so the season's hunting would be at an end.

Both sides, therefore, agreed that he must die; but while the motive of one party was a motive of pure kindness, that of the other was selfishness unmitigated. The captain, having learned the result of the deliberations, and willing to humor his men, gave his orders, in an indirect way indeed, but still very effectively: "Well, if you want to die, you poor, lazy lubber, you shall." This was enough, and the sailors pronounced it the easiest capture they had ever made. They realized

only about two barrels of oil, but to their astonishment and delight they found a large amount of first-quality ambergris, in fact the largest amount that had ever been sold in a single lot in this country. It weighed over 150 pounds, and was paid for by a firm in Boston with a check of nearly $60,000. The price of ambergris varies from $5 to $30 an ounce, according to the quality, and, as we have said, this lot was of the best.

In times past a great many desperate guesses have been made as to the origin of ambergris. Among others, in the story of the sixth voyage of "Sinbad the Sailor," in the description of the place where the voyagers were shipwrecked, we read: "Here is also a fountain of pitch and bitumen that runs into the sea which the fishes swallow and then vomit up again turned into ambergris." (We presume the author means that the fishes swallowed the bitumen, not the sea.)

Others will have it that ambergris is the gum of a submarine plant accidentally broken off in the battles of the fishes, or set free by the death and decay of the parent plant. Another view quite similar to the preceding is that of the celebrated Irish scientist of the seventeenth century, Sir Robert Boyle, who supposed it to be a vegetable product, but fossilized, like amber, whence the name, *amber-gris*, that is, gray amber. The only tinge of a probability there is in this guess is to be found in the color.

Other guesses of this stamp are hardly worth recording now, for, during the palmy days of the whaling industry, the substance was found from time to time in the intestines of the sperm whale, now dry and crumbling, now soft as putty, and again in the liquid state. This can hardly be reconciled with the vegetable theory, except perhaps on the ground that the sperm whale had become acquainted with the supposed ambergris plant, and had acquired the habit of using the gummy exudation for chewing-gum, which, in moments of distraction, he would incautiously swallow. We are not sufficiently experienced in such matters to render a positive decision on the merits of the chewing-gum theory, but we think that the case related above renders it highly probable that ambergris is indeed a diseased product of the whale himself.

The individual whose history has been detailed sickened in the midst of plenty of food, and the malady was undoubtedly caused by the unnatural growth within him. Nothing else abnormal was noticed, and yet he was indeed very sick, and would soon have died of the disease even if his life had been spared by the whalemen.

The question now arises: "What is the nature of this disease which had baffled the skill of the best cold-water physicians, and proved such a golden egg for the perfumist, but such a misfortune to the poor whale?" It has been supposed by some to be caused by a biliary irritation; but that an animal of such exemplary habits, accustomed to a simple diet and regular hours, and not addicted to the use of alcohol or tobacco, could get his bile-machiney so shockingly out of order is so very improbable that we cannot really accept it as a serious explanation. To our mind a much more probable, if not entirely certain, solution is this:

It is well known that the sperm whale, the only one that has ever been known to furnish ambergris, feeds almost exclusively on the cuttle-fish. Now, for private reasons of its own, the cuttle-fish goes armed with a sharp-pointed, curved, double, black horn, much like the beak of a parrot, only reversed; that is, the lower mandible is the longer. It has likewise been observed that the whale does not "bone his turkey," but takes it in as a unit, and this tough, indigestible horn is frequently found in specimens of ambergris. Putting this and that together, it is natural to conclude that the sharp horn sometimes gets lodged in the intestines of the whale, where it would inevitably bring on an inflammation, which is in all probability the ambergris disease. That the horn is not found in all specimens of ambergris is easily accounted for by the fact that when the fell disease had done its work, and the victim has passed over to the vast, silent majority, and has been eaten by the sharks, or has suffered natural decay and gone to pieces, the floating mass of ambergris, tossed about by the waves, would necessarily get broken up into many smaller fragments, only one of which would contain a horn.

In many cases, however, it may be possible that, by the aid of a strong constitution, the animal is enabled betimes to throw off the morbific substance and be ready for more cuttle-fish, and perhaps even for another horn. In either case, as the substance is lighter than sea-water, it would float and be carried by the currents of the ocean to those places where it does mostly love to congregate, as, for example, around the Bahama Islands, along the coasts of Brazil and of Africa, and on certain parts of the shores of the East Indies.

The disease, then, seems to be akin to the modern human disease, appendicitis—modern in the sense that its true nature has been recognized only in comparatively recent times, but old enough, and well known to our ancestors under the name of "Inflammation of the Bowels."

Only one difficulty requiring a solution remains to be considered here. If ambergris is a diseased product, why do not all the cases in which it has been found in the newly-captured whale show signs of the disease? Several answers may be given to this, any one of which should be satisfactory to an unprejudiced mind.

Firstly, if the disease has not already gone too far the patient will still be strong enough to show fight, or at least to make vigorous efforts to escape. In that case the sailors, who are seldom regular practising physicians, would hardly think of making a regular diagnosis, but would be contented with getting the oil, and more than content, even canty, at their good luck in securing the precious ambergris. They would therefore bother themselves little about the disease part of the business, but would wait quietly till the end of the voyage for their share in the booty.

Secondly, if the disease has already progressed so far as to make the animal look poor and lean, then the whalers would pass him by, just as they came near doing in the case mentioned above, and no one would be any the wiser concerning the reason of his ill-conditioned appearance.

Thirdly, what adds force to what has just been said is that the amount of ambergris usually found, when indeed any is found, in a whale is

always very much less than what was reported in the story related above. This indicates that the whale of our story was indeed much nearer the fatal ending; and this, again, accounts for the miserable appearance of the specimen in question.

Be all this as it may, the positive proof is of itself enough. Ambergris is found but rarely by the whalers—so much so that when that cry, "Ambergris!" goes up, it is much like the cry of "Land!" to the longing sailors of Columbus. It is the event of a lifetime, even to those who have been whalers from youth up, and who have taken part in the capture of perhaps hundreds of whales. Its occurrence is therefore abnormal, and is the product of an abnormal or diseased condition.

Such is the story, and such are the conclusions fairly to be drawn from it. We confess, however, to something like a feeling of disappointment. We should have been told the name of the town from which that vessel hailed, the date of the departure and of the return of that whaling expedition, the name of the vessel itself, the name of the captain and his age, for ornamental purposes at least; the latitude and longitude of the place of capture; and lastly, above all the rest, the name of the firm that gave the check—"not necessarily for publication, but as an evidence of good faith." Had these minor details been added we should have been perfectly satisfied, even without any mention of the "age or sex of the whale, or of previous condition of servitude."

But even supposing that this whole cruise were merely a cruise on paper, we are convinced, from the internal evidence given above, that ambergris is indeed a product of sperm-whale appendicitis.

T. J. A. Freeman, S. J.

Book Notices.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY. By *Hugh M. Scott, D.D.*, Professor of Eccl. Hist. in Chicago Theol. Seminary. Chicago: Theol. Sem. Press. 1896. Pp. ix., 390.

It is a wearisome and well-nigh hopeless task to follow the vagaries of German rationalistic speculation in theology during the present and the preceding generation. Though not entirely parallel with the fortune, or rather misfortune, of the transcendental philosophy, the life of recent theology has taken on much of the coloring of the ancillary science, and has lost itself no less deeply in the clouds of arbitrary theories. This is especially true of the school of Ritschl (1822–1889), which counts amongst its more or less close adherents such noted names as Harnack, Loofs, Herrmann, Häring, Kaftan, Wendt, Schürer, Schultz, all professors of high rank in the leading German universities. The Ritschlian theology, we might say philosophy, starts from a principle of cognition that blends the *apriorism* of the Kantian "forms" or categories with the Lotzean element of subjective faith. From this it follows that we have no knowledge of things in themselves, but simply as they are for us; or, as Ritschl himself puts it, "all religious judgments are judgments of value." Personal experience is thus regarded as the ultimate fact in religion. The doctrines of original sin, the Trinity and the Incarnation are rejected as metaphysical rather than religious. The divinity of Christ being denied, our Lord is declared to have been specially called to reveal God to men, a revelation which He accomplished "by a faultless life of devotion to His work of establishing the kingdom of God., *i.e.*, a community of men led by the principle of mutual love. As being the first to exemplify a perfect devotion to God's will, Christ became a mediator or priest to bring men to God. He made God known as being essentially love, the love being manifested especially in the free forgiveness of men's sins, no propitiation being needed as a condition. All pardonable sins are to be reckoned as sins of ignorance." Such doctrine would seem to imply a certain mysticism or pietism, which, however, Ritschl explicitly condemns, declaring, as he does, that "the notion of direct individual relations between men and God or Christ is essentially fanatical and mischievous." He insists on the historical character of Christianity, and maintains "that men are pardoned and saved only as they are members of the Christian community." Though holding to the Scriptures as the most authentic description of primitive Christianity, he maintains very loose opinions as to their inspiration and the scope of biblical criticism.

The special merit of Dr. Scott's lectures on the Nicene theology lies in his having, in the first place, established irrefragably from the New Testament and the doctrine of the primitive Church the divinity of our Lord, and secondly, his having exhibited and ably refuted the misstatements, contradictions and fallacies of the Ritschlian teaching on this the fundamental dogma of Christianity. He rightly conceives the question framed by our Lord Himself—"What think ye of Christ?" as "the testing inquiry to be put to all doctrines, as well as to all men."

From this standpoint the author has written his lectures. "They

treat the Nicene theology, in genius and growth, as it sets forth or shadows the person and the work of the divine Christ. It is just jealousy for this cardinal doctrine which leads him not only to give it everywhere, as did the early Church, the first place, but which leads him so often to notice the parallel treatment of it by the school of Ritschl, which puts the Logos Christology at the heart of doctrinal development, though not as the spirit of life and truth, but as the leaven of the Pharisees, the principle of secularization and error."

The value of Dr. Scott's work for a Catholic student of theology will of course not lie in its constructive elements. In this respect these lectures give no information, no point of view, that has not been set forth times beyond count in the almost limitless literature dedicated to the theme by centuries of Catholic theology. The critical elements, however, of the work commend it to the student, whose profession may call for an understanding of the trend of non-Catholic theories in these times, and who may not be able or desirous of studying the subject in the original sources; for, as the author justly claims, his is "the first attempt in English to outline the growth of the Nicine theology with any real reference to the work of the school of Ritschl."

There is a paragraph in the author's preface which, while it emphasizes the bearing of his book on the religious environment into which it is set, is at the same time a sad, though but a logical, commentary on the fate of dogmatic Christianity outside of the Catholic Church. "Various influences," he says, "at work in American religious circles make the approach of this 'dogmatic Christianity' especially dangerous just now. We are a practical people, and are apt to be caught by a theology which presents primitive Christianity as an 'impression' and not a doctrine. We are a people in a hurry, and too many of our pastors and even teachers are inclined to run after a 'simple gospel' or 'evangelical theology' rather than take the trouble to study a whole body of doctrine. We are a restive, democratic people, and the word 'dogma' has a harsh priestly (!) sound, an autocratic claim (!) to authority, all of which may turn some minds towards the 'practical' views of the new theology. The appeal 'Back to Christ,' the claim to represent the 'historic Christ,' the play upon 'the consciousness of Christ'—though there is little new in all these to English-speaking Christians—are often an 'open sesame' for these foreign teachings. Then, the new science of 'Christian Sociology' which makes the Church institutional and emphasizes 'environment' as well as 'heredity' by its teachings about the kingdom of God—though it be from quite another point of view—prepares the way for Ritschl's theology of Christ and the Church. When to these we add the fact that historic theology is probably the weakest department in the ordinary pastor's outfit—Ritschl claimed it was the strongest of his possessions—we may appreciate the better the danger for us of this new school and its corrosive treatment of the doctrines of early Christianity. 'If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?' "

Since Dr. Scott sounded this note of warning the dean of the Divinity School in the University of Chicago, Rev. Dr. Eri B. Hulbert, has told with marked approbation the story of the advance of the "new theology" amongst the Baptist divines. Writing in "The Baptist Outlook" of February 27th, he says: "The marvellous progress in the domain of natural and physical science, the recently promulgated theories of evolution, the *philosophical and theological speculations imported from Germany, the reconstructed apologetical literature adapted to present day exigencies,*" and a number of other new phases of the new learning

signalized by the writer, have "profoundly moved some of our Baptist Brothers. It has not merely changed their point of view, given them a new centre of observation, it has well nigh revolutionized the very substance of their thinking. They have a new conception of God, a new conception of Christ and of Christ's work, a new conception of man, a new conception of the Bible."

We have expressed our opinion as to the purposes the present work is likely to subserve. If to this be added a word of praise for the reverential, and even at times devotional, spirit manifested throughout, as well as for the terse, vigorous style in which the thought is expressed, we have said what good-will and justice alike demand.

Where there is so much that is commendable, it seems ungracious to criticize. We must not, however, pass over some inconsistencies and errors which we take it are rather the shortcomings of the author's religious position than of his scholarly convictions. Take, for instance, the opening sentences: Christianity is the religion of the Divine Christ Incarnate *and of His body the Church.* [Italics ours, throughout.] They are not co-ordinate, as Ritschl teaches, thereby making the Gospel move, not about one centre, God or Christ, but about two foci, Christ and His Kingdom, or Church; they are, however, *vitally one, as the Head and the members, the vine and the branches.*" "The Incarnate Son of God, revealing the fulness of the Godhead bodily through the Church by the Holy Spirit, that is the broad path of light along which all *Christian thought and life have passed from Pentacost to the present day.*" Now, if this is the true conception of the Kingdom of God, as it certainly is, how reconcile therewith the "first great mistake" with which the early Church itself is charged in her departure from the "Pauline doctrine of justification by faith?" (p. 198). "It was just here that the early Church made her *first great mistake.* She saw clearly enough that the end and aim of Christianity was blessed oneness with God through Jesus Christ; but *she failed to see adequately that the true way to this Divine Communion was through* personal justifying faith in Christ; that faith which works by love and purifies the heart. Not that faith was lost sight of; it was only *more and more obscured by its own symbols,* by other virtues, especially hope and love, and by the good works, which were its fruits. *This obscuring and limiting of justification by faith* appear at once when we observe the *baptism and admission of converts into the post-Apostolic Church.* Barnabas says: 'Baptism bears remission of sins.' Hermas says of converts: 'They go down into the water dead, and come up alive.' Others speak in the same way, *teaching essentially baptismal regeneration.*"

How the early Church came to adopt this view, our author clearly informs us. "Baptismal regeneration could find support in the words of Jesus to Nicodemus (John, iii., 3), and in His great commission (Matt., xxviii., 19, 20), which made baptism the *turning-point from paganism to keeping the commandment of Christ.* The gift of the Holy Spirit was also associated with baptism (Acts, x., 47; I. Cor., vi., 2, xii., 13). It was a sign of union with Christ (Gall., iii., 27). *Especially noticeable is the connection with the death of Jesus, which all felt was the key to salvation.* The Lord had called his own death a baptism, and Paul declared that Christians were baptized into the death of Christ. *This last statement sank deep into the heart of the Church, and was widespread early.*" Soon, "confused ideas" sprang up as to the connection between the water of baptism and regeneration. Tertullian and other early Fathers held that the Holy Spirit sanctified it. "Cyprian introduced the priest as the agent in sanctifying the water of baptism."

This confusion of mind and matter, this mystical wasting of the soul, was possible because, as Hatch has pointed out, "*they are an outflow of the earlier conceptions of matter and spirit as varying forms of a single substance.*"

The magnitude of this "great mistake" of the early Church as regards an essential to salvation our author is at pains to indicate. It "involved what Paul calls a fall from salvation by grace into salvation by works. Man's life was cleft in twain and the work of Christ divided. Before baptism man received all through faith and sovereign grace; but after baptism received all through merit, good deeds and the general mercy of God. The part of man's life before baptism was covered by the atonement of Christ; his life after baptism must be defended by his own virtue, the sacraments and the example of Christ. In other words, *Christ was only a partial Redeemer.* Part of man's experience was redeemed by Christ; the rest of it the Christian must redeem for himself. Christ was the author, but not the finisher of our faith. Such dualism left the domain of human sanctification only indirectly related to the redemption of Christ, and *this was the field in which grew up naturally defective conceptions of sin, legalism, sacramentarianism, priestcraft, and all the excesses of monkish devotion.*" The whole of the author's fourth lecture —devoted to "*the imperfect apprehension of the Divine Christ in His work of salvation and connected therewith, an inadequate view of sin, a defective theory of free-will, and the consequent growth of legalism, sacerdotalism and asceticism in the early Catholic Church*"—is replete with "theology" of this quality. When one realizes that such contradictory teaching as to the very essence of Christ's kingdom emanates from a great western theological seminary, and that it was officially delivered before the faculty and students of a yet more influential eastern institution—the Princeton Theological Seminary—one cannot but feel that indeed the approach of "undogmatic Christianity" in American religious circles is especially dangerous now, since it receives from the very work that is intended to retard the inroad one of its strongest encouragements.

After coming across the above specimen of "theological" theory, one is hardly surprised at finding passages like the following: Speaking of the view of the Ritschlians that the Jesus of history is, to our knowledge, a mere man, but to our faith God, the author remarks: "Such a view leads us back to the scepticism and acceptilation theories of Duus Scotus, *which killed scholastic theology*, and must kill all theology. because they bid us believe what is historically and philosophically false may yet be religiously and subjectively true!" (p. 34).

Elsewhere we are told how in the early centuries "sacraments were multiplied," how they got between the soul and the Saviour, till, by a strange combination of superstition and a longing for the Divine Redeemer, the *doctrine of the Mass arose in the Middle Ages—the one dogma developed in that eclipse of faith—and brought the penitent kneeling before the bread and wine, to bow also to Christ crucified.* But above all and crowning all was the thought that good works earned the pardon of post-baptismal sins. Cyprian says, "We wash away by alms" such defects. He summed up religion in "prayer and good works." These, he said, satisfied God. The Lord's Supper, which Irenæus calls "a gift," Cyprian calls "a sacrifice" offered by "a priest," and only in the Church. It was the great aid of good works. Here we find the clear outlines of early Catholicism, with its "utter materializing of religion" by legalism and priestcraft. The result was a twofold morality of "secular" Christians, who did as well as possible in the world, and "regular" Christians, who assumed the virgin, the ascetic life (p. 220).

No comment need be appended to these extracts. They evidence but too clearly the animus of the writer towards the Catholic Church. And yet Dr. Scott is not utterly intolerant, as the following concession manifests: "Ignorance, error, superstition, corruption may spot and wrinkle the churches that hold this faith [in our Lord's Divinity], as appears in Greek and Roman Catholicism; *but still they live to show an abiding power of revival and reform*"! (p. 11). F. P. SIEGFRIED.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE. By *Condè B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D.* St. Louis, Mo.: Herder. 1897. Pp. xvii. 184.

Those of our readers who have not heard Mr. Pallen's lectures on the Philosophy of Literature find awaiting them in the present work a veritable treat. Those who have had the advantage of being present at their oral delivery will be especially gratified to possess them in their present enduring form. Much, of course, more indeed at times than from the printed page, may be gained by listening to a course of lectures, but where the subject is treated with the depth that marks the present essays nothing short of thorough and repeated study will afford the looked-for satisfaction. Not that the author has failed to throw around his exposition and discussion the winsomeness of form that gives his matter easier access to the reader's mind. On the contrary, we are unable to point to any other book of its class in our language in which the deepest concepts of ontology have been exhibited with such felicity of illustration and attractiveness of figure, with just that coloring of diction which stimulates the imagination to the aptest "phantasmata" as aids to the intellect in its processes of higher abstraction. The whole trend of thought, however, is, as it was meant to be, deeply philosophical. Aptly indeed has the author entitled his work *the* philosophy and not *a* philosophy of literature, for he has studied his theme in the light of concepts and principles that are radical, essential, and, therefore, unchangeable in man's nature.

The subject falls logically into five essays, or rather lectures, for the less didactic form of the spoken discourse has been wisely retained. The first embodies the fundamental thesis on the Catholicity of Literature. Since "literature is the written expression of man's various relations to God and to his fellow-men," and since those relations are rooted in the essence of humanity, the prime characteristic of literature must be equally deep and universal.

From this germinal conception the thought develops naturally to the position that the basis of all true literary art is theology. "When we understand the theology of a people, that is, their knowledge and their conception of their relation to the Divine Being, we are on the way to a proper appreciation of their literary art, and not until we have arrived at an appreciative understanding of this vital connection between religion and art has the philosophy of literature any meaning for us" (p. 51). To the development of this thought the second lecture is devoted.

Theology, however, though the expression of the sum of man's knowledge of the truth, is not his artistic expression of that truth. "Truth finds its expression amongst men not only in the abstract formulæ of the intellect in the pure white light of speculation in which the eye of the simple intellect contemplates it, but descends from those arid heights into the concrete atmosphere of the imagination, which, like a prism, breaks the pure ray into many colors over the varied vistas of sensible existence" (p. 85).

The principles involved in literary art as the "sensible expression of unity by variety" are unfolded in the third lecture. The thoughtful reader will not fail to linger over the admirable description of the interrelations of imagination and intellect found in the opening of this lecture. The author's exposition of the ontology and psychology of art shows his mastery of Catholic philosophy. The artistic expression of his own conceptions are here the best object-lesson of his theory.

The fourth lecture offers a synthetic view of the literatures of antiquity—Oriental, Grecian, Roman. In the East the intellect is seen "swallowed up in the contemplation of an absolute unity." It knew no variety, hence it had no art. Human science was the animating spirit of Greece. Greece knew no absolute unity. "Greece was human movement incessant—a movement that began and ended in humanity. Greek art is, therefore, human art; Greek literature is human literature; both are conterminous, but neither escapes the confining bonds of the finite. It knew not sublimity, which is the breath of the infinite stirring in man's soul. It was forever seeking a change, resting nowhere, moving everywhere. Variety was the law of its restless life, and in variety it exhausts itself. Its dissolution comes through excessive movement. It divided and subdivided itself, faction against faction, sophist against sophist, school against school. It had lost all conception of the higher life of the Divine Unity, and, therefore, perished. When its own life became simply the activity of the parasite in the cadaver, it was prepared for Rome, and the Roman wolf devoured it" (p. 135).

"In time, the spirit of science becomes the formula; its life congeals into the hard and fast lines of the rule, the formulated law in which the sap of life is dried out. Rome is this formula, and she devours Greece—the spirit of science—as she had devoured Carthage, the spirit of cunning" (p. 125). "Rome neither understood variety nor unity, but it did understand the mechanism of both." Its art, therefore, and "literature were constructed on the principle of mechanics. It saw the Greek models and imitated the Greek formulæ" (p. 139). These contrasts of the pagan literatures are here brought out most vividly. The verification of the supreme law of all order, and the essence of all art, must be sought for in Christian literature.. "In Christian art and in Christian literature alone do we find the fulness of the utterance of the law of unity manifested by variety. For it is only in Jesus Christ that we find the life, the truth and the way; the Life, which is Infinite and One; the Truth, which variously manifests in the world of space and time the infinite fecundity of that absolute and Eternal Life; the Living Law, which, while it conserves and unites, at the same time distinguishes and keeps distinct the essences of all things in the order of their various being by the power of that Divine Word by which they are" (p. 152).

The closing lecture deals with the principles of style. As is the preceding, so here the subject is viewed in the light of unchanging ontological concepts.

Let us say, in conclusion, that Mr. Pallen has given Catholic students of literature a work of which they may justly feel proud. In it the central truths of Christian philosophy are set forth in the power of their essential unity, and in the beauty of the variety they take on when applied to all true literary expression, nor least strikingly in the expression in which the author himself has reflected them.

KRAUS, FRANZ XAVER, GESCHICHTE DER CHRISTLICHEN KUNST. Vol. I., pts. 1 and 2.

The Catholic literature of Germany owes a debt of gratitude to the

great publishing firm of Herder, in Freiburg. Besides Hergenröther's "History of the Church," the new edition of Wetzer and Wetze, Jansen's "History of the German People," and Pastor's "History of the Popes," they have published valuable works on almost every branch of theology and philosophy. More recently they have added to their list a series of admirable works on Christian art and archæology. We need only mention the highly-prized treatises of Liell and Wilpert on various themes discussing old Christian art in the catacombs and its relation to the teachings of the Church to show how great are the services they have rendered to the history of infant Christianity. Kraus's "History of Christian Art" is another valuable addition to Herder's catalogue. Prof. Kraus, of Freiburg, is a disciple of G. R. de Rossi, and one of the foremost German scholars in the field of Christian archæology and art. In the present work Kraus traces back to their sources not only the material elements of Christian art, its artistic forms and its methods, but also many of its representative types. Like almost all other authorities, he holds that the early Christians borrowed their forms and methods from the classical art of Greece and Rome, which they applied to the expression of Christian thought and ideals. On the very threshold of his inquiries he takes up the question, much discussed of late, whether the artistic monuments which the early Christians have left to us in the catacombs are to be regarded merely as historical documents and expressions of sepulchral symbolism, or whether they have also didactic, *i.e.*, dogmatic, significance. Of course, the very idea of sepulchral symbolism implies the setting forth of Christian doctrines on the future life and of our Lord's relation thereto. But Kraus, dissenting from the Protestant school of archæology in Germany and from some Catholic writers, like Le Blant, teaches that from the beginning Christian art was didactic in its character. On the art of the catacombs, above all, Kraus speaks as a master, tracing it through its phases and pointing out its bearings on early Church history. We may note, by the way, that, in Kraus's opinion, the catacombs, in view of the narrow limits of the confined rooms found in them, cannot have been the usual places of worship of the Roman Christians, even in times of persecution. When we reach the age of Constantine the Great and the triumph of the Cross, new problems present themselves to the art historian. What was the origin of the Christian basilica, *i.e.*, of the modern Christian Church? The old view, held from the time of Leone Battista Alberti (+ 1472) till 1869, derived its essential form, as well as its name, from the old Roman market basilica (*b. forensis*). This is now falling more and more into disrepute. Kraus discusses in succession the various theories that have been invented to account for the origin of the basilica. Dehio's hypothesis (of which Schultze also claims to be the author, and which has been adopted by Crostarosa and numerous others) regards the basilica as an adaptation and development of the plan of a Roman or Greek house for the purpose of Christian worship. Its supporters uphold their views by pointing out, on the one hand, that the three essential parts of the basilica find their prototypes in the *ostium*, the *atrium* and the *tablinum* of the private Roman residence; on the other hand, that the early Christians from the day of Pentecost met in private houses. Kraus, however, does not favor Dehio's views. The early Christians, he calls attention, met in the upper rooms (ὑπερῶα), not on the ground-floor of private houses. He still holds with de Rossi that we must look for the origin of the basilica in the *basilica cimetrialis*, an overground, trefoil-shaped structure found near burial-places and sometimes near the entrance of catacombs. The open side of this

building was lengthened, he thinks, and gave rise to the basilica type. However, the recent discovery of temples for the celebration of pagan mysteries (orphic, etc.), and the uncovering of very old Christian churches in Africa and Syria have supplied new elements that must be considered in the solution of the problem. The basilica of Maxentius, in Rome itself, built before Constantine's triumph, must likewise be taken into consideration.

In his chapters on early Christain painting, also, Kraus discusses many interesting questions. The earliest images of our Saviour, he shows, represents Him without beard. The first picture of the Madonna and Child is found in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, and dates back to the third century. The traditional representations of Sts. Peter and Paul, Kraus thinks, may probably be derived from portraits, which, in his opinion, is hardly the case with the images of Christ. Christ crucified, except in the celebrated caricature found on the Palatine Hill, is not represented until the middle of the fourth century. But we cannot enter into further details. Suffice it to say that the volume furnishes interesting, important disquisitions on all the lesser branches of ancient Christian art, artistic glasses, mosaics, the miniatures of the earliest illustrated Christian books, terra-cottas, goldsmiths' work, intaglios, rings, wood and ivory carving, even on the liturgical vessels and vestments. On all these subjects our author brings us the results of the latest finds and investigations. In the latter part of the volume he discusses the Byzantine question, which has lately become the subject of lively controversy. It is important in determining the sources of later Christian art, and most interesting in itself. The volume is furnished with about five hundred illustrations, many of them repeated from Martigny, it is true, but many of them entirely new, and all exceedingly instructive. In short, Kraus's "History of Christian Art" should be wanting in the library of no Catholic scholar. Why should not an English translation be published? It is certainly desirable. C. G. H.

SCHOEPFER, DR. AEMILIAN. Bibel und Wissenschaft, Brixen. 1896.

A year or two ago Dr. Schoepfer, professor in the diocesan seminary of Brixen, published a History of the Old Testament. In this work parts of the sacred narrative were interpreted in a manner differing materially from the interpretation of most of the Fathers, and we may say of most of the elder Catholic theologians. The six days of creation, for instance, Dr. Schoepfer held not to be six periods of twenty-four hours each, the geographical universality of the deluge was abandoned, etc. The book calls forth much comment, and, we may add, much hostile criticism. The chief of these critics was Dr. F. Kaulen, the editor of the new edition of Wetzer and Wetze's "Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia." Dr. Schoepfer has considered it his duty to himself and to his seminary to reply to Dr. Kaulen, to set forth the evangelical principles by which he is guided, and to show that they are in entire harmony with the teachings of the Church, and especially with the Encyclical *Providentissimus* published by the Holy Father in 1894. The present work on the Bible and Science has the approbation of the Prince-Bishop of Brixen. Dr. Schoepfer tells us in his preface that in principle he agrees substantially with the learned Jesuit, F. Brucker, who has recently written a work entitled "Questions actuelles d'Ecriture Sainte" (Paris, 1895.) Schoepfer's views may be summarized as follows: The *truth* of science cannot contradict the dicta of Holy Writ. The Bible, if correctly interpreted, is always true. Should there appear to be a conflict between the Scripture and Science, this conflict is only apparent.

The seeming contradiction may be due to a misunderstanding of technical terms, or it may be owing to the erroneous interpretation of Scripture on the one hand, or to the false claims of scientists who propound as settled truth what is merely an hypothesis or an opinion on the other. An interpretation of Holy Writ which cannot be harmonized with the undoubted facts of nature does not represent the true meaning intended by the Holy Ghost. Every opinion held by scientists that contradicts the *true* sense of Scripture is erroneous. The Bible and Science may treat of the very same subject, but they treat them from wholly different points of view. Consequently they may vary in the *presentation* of the same subject. Scripture was written with a view to the salvation of souls, and is therefore popular in matter and language. The aim of Science is to enlarge our natural knowledge, and has created and uses a technical language of its own which we must not look for in Holy Writ. Proceeding to analyse the Papal Encyclical, *Provudentissimus*, he deduces therefrom the principle that profane science may be used not only to defend Holy Writ, but also to interpret it. In determining the true sense of a biblical text, Leo XIII., Schoepfer says, insists that exegetists must bear in mind the aim of Holy Writ. God does not intend by its means to make known the truths of natural science. This does not prevent the Sacred Writers from including scientific facts in their statements; but in doing so they use, not the language of Science, but the language of the people. Now, it is the peculiarity of popular speech to speak of natural phenomena as they fall under the senses. Hence the Scriptures speak of the sun moving and the earth standing still. A second rule, propounded by the Encyclical, Schoepfer formulates as follows: The true sense of a scriptural passage is not always the sense formerly attributed to it. In questions not affecting faith and morals, *i.e.*, on questions of natural science, Schoepfer tells us the Holy Father teaches that neither the *sensus obvius* nor the consensus of the Fathers is a guarantee of correct interpretation, and counsels the exegetist not to interpret Scripture in a sense conflicting with the universal opinion of scientists on a question of science. Dr. Schoepfer then goes on to test these views by examining what the writings of the Fathers, the mediæval doctors, and the modern Catholic theologians, especially the Jesuits, say on the subject of scriptural hermeneutics. He examines at considerable length the views of St. Augustine, Albertus Magnus, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, F. F. Pererius, Patrizi and Palmieri, and the decree of the Council of Trent on the interpretation of Holy Writ.

Passing to the practical application of his principles, the author first takes up the biblical account of the creation. The work of creation, according to his opinion, was not completed in six days of twenty-four hours each, and the parts of the universe were not created in the order recited by the Bible. The Sacred Writer in this recital had not an historical but an ideal aim. In short, Dr. Schoepfer is an ideal concordist.

On the Deluge controversy his opinion may be condensed as follows: The Deluge did not extend to the entire earth. Whether all mankind (except Noah and his family) was destroyed is an open question. The great ethnological table of the tenth chapter of Genesis does not include the ancestors of the nations of the earth, Schoepfer holds, and cites Hummelauer, Brunengo, Vigouroux and Manuci in support of his thesis. Lastly, the author sees in the confusion of tongues at Babel an event of a local rather than of a universal character. The men gathered in Sennaar were not the whole human race at that time living, but more probably one branch, probably a populous branch of Noah's family.

The book is interestingly written, and the controversy, while vigorous, is dignified and impersonal. C. G. H.

SAINT BENEDICT; AN HISTORICAL DISCOURSE ON HIS LIFE. By the *Right Rev. Abbot Tosti*, of the Benedictine Cassinese Congregation. Translated from the Italian, with the author's special permission, by the *Very Rev. William Romuald Canon Woods, O. S. B.*, with a Preface by the *Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.*, Bishop of Newport. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., Ltd. Price, $2.75 net. Received from Benziger Brothers.

It has been a standing complaint among Catholic Italian writers that it is next to impossible for them to gain a hearing for their very best productions beyond the confines of Italy, their only chance of widening their audience being through the medium of French translations. As a matter of fact, an untold number of excellent Italian books are practically unknown beyond the Alps, except to the favored few who have learned the language of Petrarch and Dante. Among these may well be numbered the valuable historical monographs of Abbot Tosti, which have been before the Italian public so many years that we were somewhat surprised to read in Bishop Hedley's Preface that the author is still among the living. A tardy beginning is now being made by his English brethren to introduce this deserving author to the English-speaking world, and the opening is made with his historical treatise of the life of the illustrious patriarch of Western monasticism, St. Benedict. This treatise, although not the most successful of Tosti's literary labors, is a fair specimen of his work. It is replete with erudition, a model of exactness, and written in the glowing style which characterizes the productions of an able Italian when discoursing upon a favorite theme. If we were to venture any criticism of this modern Italian style, now that we are in hopes of welcoming a large number of the best works of that country in our cold English tongue, we should say that it suffers from the baneful influence of Teutonic nebulosity. Just as Verdi in his old age has endeavored to infuse Wagnerism into the pure stream of Italian melody, and with dubious results, so have many of the foremost Italian writers of our day, thinking to improve upon the limpid current of the old Italian masters, introduced a bastard, Kantistic, mystagogic mode of writing from the German, which may, for all we know, be intelligible to Germans, but which neither Carlyle could make palatable to us nor Tosti to his countrymen. If we could hope to be heard in Italy, we would most earnestly entreat those great and learned scholars to eliminate this foreign jargon and resume the lovely, simple speech of their ancestors. To illustrate our meaning, we shall quote a typical passage from the book before us. Abbot Tosti has just narrated with touching simplicity the story of Benedict's retirement from the world to his solitude of Subiaco: Gregory the Great had shown how so heroic a deed should be described. But suddenly the learned Abbot breaks loose from his sober guide and rhapsodizes in a way which to Gregory would have been highly suggestive of temporary insanity, but which we recognize as being purely German transcendental bosh:

"What appeared to many as a Brahmin's narcotic fetichism was a reflection of the mind upon itself, a powerful concentration of its faculties, a fertilizing of its powers, an aspiration towards an act unperformed by most men. It was an invocation of Absolute Virtue, which is God. The outcome of this spiritual energy I consider to be contemplation, which gave such beauty to certain souls in the poetical paradise of Alighieri. This phenomenon of mystic psychology does not manifest

itself to him who, luxuriating in reason's delights, does not believe ; but even the Pagans learned it from the catechism of nature," etc.

If this be "modernizing" Gregory, give us the grand old Pontiff in the sober simplicity of his classical toga, and if any attempt be made to inoculate such humbuggery upon our own speech, let us persecute it mercilessly to the death. Certainly, had we undertaken to introduce Tosti to English readers, we should have taken the liberty, out of regard for his reputation, carefully to expunge this and many similar passages. The very fact that the book is so excellent and timely would have made us extremely solicitous to make it as nearly perfect as possible. A book which seeks an audience must speak a language which people readily understand.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the French Jesuit Missionaries among the Indians of Canada and the Northern and Northwestern States of the United States, 1610–1791, with numerous Historical, Geographical and Ethnological Notes, etc., and an Analytical Index. Under the editorial direction of *Reuben Gold Thwaites*, Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; editor of "The Wisconsin Historical Collections," etc. Cleveland, Ohio: The Burrows Brothers Company.

We are proud to give the full title of the most important historical collection which has hitherto appeared in this country, and we mark as a significant note of the times that this great enterprise is editorially and typographically of Western origin. We observe, too, and not without a certain feeling of sadness, that there is not a cent of Catholic money in the entire undertaking. May it issue in waking our Catholic students and capitalists to the disgraceful neglect in which the glorious labors of the pioneer saints and missionaries of this continent have been left by our apathy. We sincerely regret that our late lamented friend and contributor, Dr. John Gilmary Shea, is no longer alive to enjoy this great publication, and to lend to the learned editor the valuable aid of his talents and experience. As the edition is limited to 750 copies, and consequently will soon be exhausted, we hope that those whom it concerns will see to it that our Catholic libraries shall be supplied in time. Mr. Thwaites calculates that the entire collection will be completed in about sixty octavo volumes of 300 pages each. The price has been placed at $3.50 net per volume, which, in consideration of the typographical excellence of the publication, must be regarded as extremely moderate. It is the most appropriate present that could be made to the libraries of our Catholic colleges and seminaries.

The idea, then, is to allow the early Jesuit missionaries to tell the story of their labors and experiences in their own simple style. An exact *verbatim et literatim* reprint of the very rare French, Latin and Italian originals, both manuscript and printed, is accompanied, page for page, by a complete English translation. Some complaints having been made of inaccuracies in the first volume, extraordinary care has been taken to secure the greatest accuracy in the sequel. It is easy to understand that the language of religious, writing in a free and unaffected manner to their superiors, will at times contain technical terms apt to be misunderstood by those who do not profess to be skilled theologians. But we can safely rely on an editor like Mr. Thwaites sparing no pains to secure as correct as possible a translation of the text. Many expressions unintelligible to a layman could be explained quite easily by the nearest priest, and we have been told that it is the intention to submit the proofs to a learned Catholic clergyman for revision. This, surely, is the most rational course.

Four volumes have already appeared, dealing with the early travels and explorations of the Jesuit missionaries in Acadia and Quebec. We beg to call especial attention to the able and sympathetic words with which the editor introduces his *dramatis personæ* to his readers, giving a bird's-eye view of the whole subject, and enforcing the importance of the original narratives to all who desire to gain a correct knowledge of the early days of American colonization. Our present Pontiff, Leo XIII., has drawn attention to the important part taken by religion in the opening up of the new world. The documents now given to the public enforce the same lesson with a pathos far superior to the labored rhetoric of later historians.

Mr. Thwaites thus explains the nature and contents of these "Relations":

It was the duty of the Jesuit missionaries "annually to transmit to their superior in Quebec or Montreal a written journal of their doings; it was also their duty to pay occasional visits to their superior, and to go into retreat at the central house of the Canadian mission. Annually, between 1632 and 1673, the superior made up a narrative, or 'Relation,' of the most important events which had occurred in the several missionary districts under his charge, sometimes using the exact words of the missionaries, and sometimes with considerable editorial skill summarizing the individual journals in a general account, based in part upon the oral reports of visiting fathers. This annual 'Relation,' which in bibliography occasionally bears the name of the superior, and at other times of the missionarry chiefly contributing to it, was forwarded to the provincial of the order in France, and, after careful scrutiny and re-editing, was published by him in a series of duodecimo volumes, known collectively as 'The Jesuit Relations.'"

Our readers will need no further words from us to appreciate the vast importance of this great undertaking, and they will join with us in the hope that the historical instinct will be found sufficiently alive amongst us to warrant the speedy completion of this and many a similar publication.

Ontologia Metaphysica Generalis, *Auctore P. Carolo Delmas, S.J.* Parisiis: Victor Retaux, via Bonaparte, 82. 1896. Pp. xxx., 882. Pr., 8 francs.

Students of neo-scholastic philosophy have no grounds for complaint as to lack of material to aid them in their study. Within quite recent times a number of important works have been placed within their reach, any one of which would have been regarded as a boon by the students of a generation ago; a generation, however, itself by no means deficient in works kindred, if not of quite so thorough and timely a character. To one of these recent works, Fr. Pesch's Psychology, the latest addition to the *Cursus Lacensis*, the attention of our readers was called in the last number of this Review. It is gratifying to be able to welcome here and now another no less important and valuable accession to the literature of Catholic philosophy in the general metaphysics or ontology of Père Delmas. The author, having had the experience of twenty years as professor of philosophy in the higher institutions of learning within the Society of Jesus, certainly may claim to speak with authority on his specialty. To one familiar with the subject little examination of the work is needed to convince him that it is the production of a thoroughly philosophical mind, broad and deep and clear of vision. The author has no ambition to be called original, in the sense that he has discovered or invented a new metaphysic. The history of

philosophy is already too sad a story of the fate of such aspirations. He accepts the solidly established truths of the *ancient* philosophy, and seeks to expound and demonstrate them in a way adapted to the needs and capacities of the modern student. Following the teaching of Aristotle, St. Thomas and Suarez, he presents the teaching of these masters, not on authority, of course, but on its intrinsic reasons and principles. In this, however, he is but one of a large class. He does but what a score of Catholic philosophers have been doing the past few years. The merit that deserves especial emphasis in the work is its constant insistance on and justification of the objectivity of metaphysics and metaphysical concepts. It is this feature of the work that gives it a timeliness which is not always predicateable of discussions of its class. The empirical or positivist philosophy prevailing outside Catholic schools has won a certain measure of popularity, on the one hand, by its claimed adherence to reality, to facts, to the ascertained results of physical science, and consequently, on the other hand, by its disregard and contempt for metaphysics. What Catholic philosophers have, therefore, most to vindicate in these days is the scientific character of ontology, its harmony with all that physical science has verified, in the order of experience, and the objective validity of abstractions which constitute the subject matter of metaphysics. In this lies the merit of Père Delmas's work that this insistance on objectivity is kept constantly in the foreground. At the very outset the objective validity and scientific constitution of metaphysics is solidly established against materialism, agnosticism and the Kantian criticism. Thus, as the concepts of the science come up for treatment, to each subject are assigned two theses—one to analyze the content, the other to prove its extra-mental foundation. In this fashion are set forth the notion of being, essence, potentiality and actuality, unity, truth, goodness, substance, nature, personalty, accident, morality, quality, relation, cause, action, finality, the infinite, and beauty. Students familiar with the way in which these higher abstractions are sometimes treated will not fail to appreciate the value of a work in which the appeal to objectivity is so insisted on.

The work is intended as a text-book for classes of philosophy in universities and higher ecclesiastical seminaries, as well as an adjunct to theological study. It is not, therefore, elementary, and will reveal its excellencies only to serious study. At the same time the author has done much, by well-ordered arrangement of parts, by clearness of definition and precision of argument, by simplicity and lucidity of style, as well as by neat adaptations of letter-press, to lighten the labor of the student.

F. P. S.

Songs, Chiefly from the German. By *J. L. Spalding*, Bishop of Peoria. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Company. 1896. Price, $1.25.

In his poetry, as in his prose, Bishop Spalding delights in a direct style, concentrated phraseology, crisp, neat, clear English. He translates from the work of the very famous, as well as of the less familiar, names in the long and honorable roll of German lyric poets. He is no unworthy competitor for honors in the similarly long list of translators from the German—Mangan, Baskerville, Merivale, Phillips, and their compeers who have done less work, if not less nobly, in this line. He is felicitous in his selection of adjectives—the most difficult task of a translator—such power dwells in a single word! Sometimes, however, he is not free from a taint—if it be a taint—of Carlylean ruggedness of phrase, a Teutonization of language perhaps unconsciously put on by both writers

in their foreign workshop. On p. 89, for instance, we read *on-glide* in the first stanza, and *on roll* in the second :

"The clouds and winds and waves on-glide,"

"I hear the years on roll."

He is happy in the selection of his themes. The poems take us out into the fresh air, the warm sunshine, the moist woodland, by cool waters and quiet pastures :

"Fall fast, O pattering rain, fall fast,
Awake again the slumbering dreams
Of childish days, too sweet to last,
With all their many-tinted gleams,

"When in the sultry summer hours,
Upon the parched and thirsty earth,
Poured down thy cool refreshing showers,
And drooping corn rose glad as mirth.

* * * * * * * *

"Ah ! would that I again might hear
The rain's moist rustle round my head,
Sweet as are thoughts of all the dear
Who lie in their cool, earthy bed."

One would think that Longfellow's almost literal version of Goethe's *Der du von dem Himmel bist* should render any following attempt superfluous. But, although differing from the original in metre, while Longfellow's retained it, the version of Bishop Spalding is adequate and fine. The publishers have given the gems an elegant setting ; they have left nothing to be desired in the paper, the printing, or the binding. The volume is a thing of beauty.

Demon Possession and Allied Themes. Being an inductive study of phenomena of our own times. By *Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D.* Chicago, New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, $1.50.

The author of this remarkable book was for forty years a Protestant missionary in China, and is highly extolled, by those who knew him personally, for his great learning, vigorous and well-trained intellect, sound judgment, and, not the least commendation to Catholics, "childlike attitude towards the truth." He died in Southern China in the year 1892, leaving this book in the hands of Henry W. Rankin, Esq., for publication.

Dr. Nevius went to China wholly unprepared to meet cases of demoniac possession in modern life, but was led on, by his actual experiences among the heathen, to a gradual appreciation of the fact that the demons whom Our Lord was wont to eject from the bodies of unfortunate men were still in active existence, and could, even at the present day, be made to tremble and flee at the invocation of the Sacred Name. Phenomena met him at every turn which he could only ascribe to a preternatural agency, and he states the process of his final conversion to belief in actual demon-possession with a calmness which must impress every reader who has not deliberately hardened his soul against faith in the supernatural.

After stating his own experiences, he enters into a discussion of the

philosophy of the subject, rejects the false theories of so-called science, and declares his explicit belief in the literal interpretation of the frequent narratives of possession and exorcism found in the New Testament. It is needless to say that the Holy Catholic Church has never swerved from this position, and it is difficult to credit those who refuse to believe in a doctrine so clearly and emphatically inculcated by Scripture with any faith either in Christ or in the supernatural. The testimony of an "evangelical" missionary on a question so derided by modern infidelity cannot but be looked upon as extremely valuable, and we congratulate both the author and his editor upon their courage.

ARCHÆOLOGIE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN KUNST. *D. Victor Schultze.* Munich, 1895.

Alongside side of Kraus's great work, Schultze's "Archæology of Ancient Christian Art" is an elementary book. Indeed it aims to be little more, and yet it is in many ways interesting. Schultze is perhaps the chief Protestant authority on Christian archæology in Germany. We are, therefore, not surprised to find him contest Kraus's views on many points. Especially on the question of the principles that should guide the scholar in interpreting the paintings in the catacombs, Schultze has for many years vigorously sought to exclude their application to the illustration of Christian dogma. In the present volume, however, his controversy is less dogmatic and bitter. No doubt the work of Wilpert and Liell, as well as Kraus's arguments, have somewhat shaken his convictions. On the origin of the Christian basilica he is an ardent advocate of Dehio's views, which in fact he claims to have propounded before Dehio himself. Among Catholics Crostrarosa supports this theory. While by no means so full, nor, in our opinion, so fair a book as Kraus's work, which always recites the argument opposed to his opinion, Schultze's volume is a clear and brief setting forth of the main facts, illustrating ancient Christian art, and is well fitted to introduce a beginner into its mysteries.

FESTSCHRIFT ZUM ELFHUNDERTJAEHRIGEN JUBILAEUM DES DEUTSCHEN CAMPO SANTO IN ROM. Herausgegeben von *Dr. Stephan Ehses.* Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder. 1897.

This is a collection of some twenty-five short monographs by as many German investigators of Christian antiquities contributed as a mark of esteem for the distinguished founder and rector of the college established at the Campo Santo in Rome, Monsignor de Waal. The proximate occasion of their writing is the wish to commemorate the eleventh hundredth anniversary of the establishment by Charlemagne of the hospice for northern pilgrims to the tomb of the Apostle. Among the names of several, as yet unkown to fame, we are pleased to note those of some whose merits have obtained a world-wide reputation, notably the learned Jesuit, Professor Grisar, who contributes a valuable paper on the *Pallium.* The entire volume, from both a literary and typographical standpoint, is worthy of the occasion.

THE ABBE DE LAMENNAIS AND THE LIBERAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN FRANCE. By the *Hon. W. Gibson.* Longmans, Green & Co.: London, New York and Bombay. 1896.

We were at work upon the study of this deeply interesting book with a view of making an extended notice, when our labors were super-

seded by the exhaustive paper of our esteemed contributor, Dr. Parsons, with whose views we are in full accord. It was to be expected that a biographer of the ill-fated Lamennais should be rather unduly biased by his sympathies, for his erratic hero seems to have been led to his ruin by the very exaggeration of his zeal for religion; but the decisions of Rome, and of history, cannot afford to be influenced by any other consideration than the cold, merciless objective truth. Error is only a temporary derangement, and it is the duty, as well of writers as of readers, to keep their sentiments and sympathies under the complete control of their reason. In some passages, we fear, Mr. Gibson will be found to have failed to do so. But, one the whole, the sad tale is narrated with admirable taste and skill.

LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS. By *Rev. Louis Jouin, S.J.* St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y. Pp. ix., 263.

Father Jouin, professor of philosophy in the Jesuit College at Fordham, whence this book emanates, is the author of a course of scholastic philosophy in Latin. The first of the two volumes of that course on Logic and Metaphysics is given in an English dress in the present manual. The latter adheres very closely to the text of the former. Those who are familiar, therefore, with the terse compendiousness of the author's Latin will find his English style not redundant. The book is essentially a class manual. In the hands of an able teacher, fairly well versed in Catholic philosophy, it will prove serviceable.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS WORTHILY CELEBRATED. From the French of the Rev. Father Chaignon, S.J. By the *Right Rev. L. De Goesbriand, D.D.*, Bishop of Burlington, Vt. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, printers to the Apostolic See. 1897. Price, $1.50 net.

SHORT SERMONS FOR EVERY SUNDAY OF THE YEAR AND THE PRINCIPAL FEASTS. From the French. By *Rev. Thomas F. Ward*, Church of St. Charles Borromeo, Brooklyn, N. Y. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Price, $1.25 net.

THOUGHTS FOR ALL TIMES. By the *Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughn*, with a preface by the Right Rev. J. C. Hedley, D.D., O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. The Roxburghe Press, Westminster. Received from Benziger Brothers. Price, $1.50 net.

SOCIALISM AND CATHOLICISM. From the Italian of Count Edward Soderini. By *Richard Jenery-Shee*, of the Inner Temple, with a preface by Cardinal Vaughn. London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co.

LIFE OF CARDINAL MANNING, with a critical examination of E S. Purcell's mistakes. By *Francis De Pressensé*, a French Protestant. Translated by Francis T. Furey, A.M. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey. 1897.

ROME AND ENGLAND, or Ecclesiastical Continuity. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates, Lim. Received from Benziger Brothers.

THE CHAPLAIN'S SERMONS. By *Rev. John Talbot Smith, LL.D.* New York: William H. Young & Co., 31 Barclay Street. Price, $1.50 net.